

# NEW CHURCH MISCELLANIES;

OR,

## ESSAYS

ECCLESIASTICAL, DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL,

12 BY GEORGE BUSH. 1860

---

[Republished from the New Church Repository.]

---

New-York:

WM. McGEORGE, No. 47 BIBLE HOUSE.

BOSTON: OTIS CLAPP; PHILADELPHIA: BERICK & TAFEL;

LONDON: WM. WHITE.

---

1855.

JOHN P. PRALL, PRINTER,

NO. 9 SPRUCE-ST. N. Y.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE KINGSHIP, - - - - -	5
PREACHING, - - - - -	69
THE MINISTRY, - - - - -	82
THE N. J. MAGAZINE AND THE N. C. MINISTRY, - -	103
N. C. ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT, - - - -	120
A TRAINED AND PROFESSIONAL CLERGY, - - -	146
THE PARTY OF ORDER AND THE PARTY OF LIBERTY, - -	157
APHORISMS ON SLAVERY AND ABOLITION, - - -	165
PSEUDO-SPIRITUALISM, - - - - -	239
SLEEP, - - - - -	289
THE N. C. SYSTEM REFERABLE SOLELY TO A DIVINE ORIGIN,	314
SWEDENBORG AND PAUL, - - - - -	369

## ERRATA.

On page 346, ninth line from bottom, for "spiritual illumined," read "spiritual *illuminees*."

On page 354, ninth line from the bottom, for "remorseless" read "*remorseful*."



## THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE KINGSHIP.

(N. C. Repos. April, May, June. 1852.)

"And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation."—Ex. xix. 3-6.

THE distinction and pre-eminence which accrued to the people of Israel, as a representative people, constitutes the theme of a large portion of the Sacred Volume. Their history as a people has ever been regarded as one of the most striking phases of the Divine Providence, and yet it has been deemed a problem how such a people could have stood in a peculiar state of favoritism with Heaven. They were of a genius so perverse and intractable—so prone to idolatry—so dull, so gross, so carnal—that it seems incredible that such a prerogative should have been accorded to them. The difficulty on this score, in respect to the whole nation, is substantially the same with that in regard to David, one of its brightest and most distinguished sons. With the history of this remarkable personage in our hands, it has been with thousands a serious question how he could have been denominated "a man after God's own heart," when his conduct, on various occasions, would appear to have stamped him rather as a man after the Devil's own heart, and that too in despite of many interesting and attractive traits in his character.

The solution of this difficulty is to be found in the views of the Divine Word, and the Divine Providence, which are opened and inculcated in the writings of the

New Church on the subject of representatives. "It is a thing of indifference," says our illumined author, "what the quality of the man who represents, whether he be evil or good; for evil men may alike represent and did represent the Lord's Divine (principle). The same may appear from the representatives which exist even at this day; for all Kings, whosoever they are, and of whatsoever quality, by virtue of the principle of royalty appertaining to them, represent the Lord; in like manner all Priests, whosoever or of whatsoever quality they are, by virtue of the priestly principle. The principle of royalty (*regium*), and the priestly principle (*sacerdotale*) is holy, whatsoever be the nature and quality of the person who ministers them; hence it is, that the Word taught by a wicked person is alike holy, as when taught by a good person, and also the Sacrament of Baptism and the Holy Supper, and the like."—*A. C.* 3670. Now we learn that the Jewish nation sustained a representative character, and that their whole outward history was a designed forecasting of the interior or spiritual history of the true church, in all subsequent time. The truth involved in this position is not so entirely and exclusively of New Church origin, but that it has been dimly perceived in all ages, by the possessors of the divine revelation, that there was a latent allusion in the history of Israel to the Christian Church. The bondage of that people in Egypt—their deliverance thence—their long sojourn in the wilderness—and their entrance into Canaan—have ever been regarded as a significant adumbration or type of the interior or spiritual history of the Lord's true church, in the various periods of time. On the principle of representation, their character as a people may have been internally bad or sadly defective, and yet they may have answered this end; and thus viewed, their whole history is a kind of pictorial shadowing forth of the inner career and experience of the Christian man. This career and experience may be read on this symbolical tablet somewhat as Æneas read the fortunes of Troy depicted on the walls of Dido's palace at Carthage.

In this typical character, therefore, of the Jewish race, we have a key to the import of the passage before us—"Ye shall be to me a holy nation, a kingdom of priests." It is palpable that the declaration never became a literal truth, as the priesthood was restricted to the family of Aaron; nor for the same reason was it predicable solely of the nation itself. It looked or penetrated through them to some other people in whom it should receive a more emphatic fulfilment. But, in order to grasp this more adequately, it will be expedient to go a little into the nature of priesthood and royalty—the mitre and the crown—and learn what is implied by both.

When we consider that the whole Jewish ritual was appointed by Jehovah himself, we must of necessity suppose that there was some worthy mystery shadowed forth by the splendid and pompons array of dresses and duties pertaining to the High Priest and his subordinate officials. Aaron, invested with his pontifical robes, was, next to the Tabernacle and the Ark of the Covenant, the most conspicuous feature of that dispensation. Upon him it devolved to lead the worship of the nation; to preside at the altar service; to see that the sacrificial rites were duly performed, and all the various minutiae of the ceremonial strictly observed. Behold him, then, coming forth from the Most Holy Place of the Tabernacle, his head adorned with a mitre, and that part of it which covered the forehead having a golden plate with the inscription, *KODESH LA-HOVAH*, *holiness to the Lord*; his shoulders crowned with onyx epaulettes, and bearing the appendant ephod; his bosom covered with the breastplate, glittering with precious stones, and his robe fringed with pomegranates and bells, which latter tinkled continually as he ministered at the altar and through the camp. Behold him, I say, thus arrayed in "garments of glory," and let us ask ourselves whether such a splendid pageant could have been got up by the Divine command, simply to feast the eyes of the congregation upon the parade and glitter of a sacred raree-show. Could such a display have been designed as a mere gewgaw to de-

light the senses of a gross and worldly-minded people, as the uniform of soldiers does the eyes of children? Surely not. We must recognize some higher aim in these appointments. We must realize in them a representative display, and a display in the first instance of the Lord himself, for He is pre-eminently the substance of these magnificent shadows. Look then at him through the transparent veil of the priestly ordinances. Gaze at Aaron till Aaron disappears from view, and you behold the Lord himself as the grand and absorbing reality—the sum and substance—the body and verity—of the Aaronic mysteries.

But the simple recognition of the Lord as the substance of the representation, will still leave us far short of attaining an adequate idea of priesthood. It is peculiar to the spirit of New Church teachings that they prompt to a process of breaking down or resolution of all generals into particulars, and of particulars into singulars. The mind of the Newchurchman, acuminated by the habits which it necessarily forms of exact discrimination, is led onward to a close analysis of the component ideas entering into all general and comprehensive terms. When, therefore, he finds the Lord himself denominated a Priest, he is conscious that he has no clear perception of the truth involved in this designation, until he ascertains the essential principle in the Divine nature of which this title is more especially predicated. Now, as the fundamental ideas of the Divine Being are those of love and wisdom, or goodness and truth, so it is evident that we are to seek for the grounds of the Divine priestly dignity in one or the other of these principles. And here it is that we are prepared to welcome the light that is afforded us in the following paragraph from our illustrious authority, in explaining the passage, Rev. xx. 6, "They shall be priests of God and of Christ."

"By priests, in the Word, are meant those who are in the good of love, and by kings those who are in the truths of wisdom: wherefore it is said above, 'Jesus Christ hath made us *kings* and *priests*,' Apoc. i. 6; and likewise, 'the Lamb hath made us *kings* and *priests*, that we

may reign over the earth,' v, 16 ; and it may be seen plainly, that the Lord will not make men kings and priests, but that He will make angels of those who are in truths of wisdom, and in the good of love from Him ; that by kings are meant those who are in truths of wisdom from the Lord, and that the Lord is called a king in consequence of His divine truth, may be seen above, n. 31, 625, 941, 1242 : but the reason why by priests are meant those who are in the good of love from the Lord, is, because the Lord is divine love and divine wisdom, or, what amounts to the same, divine good and divine truth ; and the Lord in consequence of His divine love or divine good, is called a priest, and in consequence of His divine wisdom or divine truth is called a king : hence it is, that there are two kingdoms, into which the heavens are distinguished, the celestial and the spiritual ; and the celestial kingdom is called the Lord's priestly kingdom, for the angels there are recipients of divine love or divine good from the Lord, and the spiritual kingdom is called the Lord's royal kingdom, for the angels there are recipients of divine wisdom or divine truth from the Lord. It is said that they are recipients of divine good and divine truth from the Lord, but it is to be observed, that they are continually receiving them, for divine good and divine truth cannot be appropriated to any angel or man, so as to be his own, but only so that they may seem to be his, because they are divine ; wherefore no angel or man can produce from himself any thing good or true, which is really good and true in itself ; whence it is plain, that they are kept in what is good and true by the Lord, and that they are so kept continually ; for which reason, if any one comes to heaven, and thinks that good and truth are appropriated to him as his own, he is immediately let down from heaven and instructed. From these considerations then it may appear, that by their being priests of God and Christ, is signified because those are kept by the Lord in the good of love, and thereby in the truths of wisdom."—*A. E.* 1265.

From this we learn that the priestly element in the Divine nature is the good of love, and that it is the same principle, in its measure, which forms the basis of a true spiritual priesthood in the man of the church. It is this principle, therefore, which is represented by the external official priesthood of the Old Dispensation. But on this head we shall have more to say in the sequel.

In the ancient representative church both the priesthood and the royalty were conjoined in one person, because the good and the truth which proceed from the Lord are united, as they are united also in the angels of Heaven. Melchizedek, "king of righteousness, and king of peace," may be considered as a prominent type

of this order of things, in which character, or as a representative of the Lord, he blessed Abraham, the greatest man then living, and offered him bread and wine in reference to these two principles, they being the symbols respectively of the good of love and the truth of faith. In this relation we perceive more adequately the purport of the Divine declaration, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." The same train of remark throws light upon the historical phases in which the race of Israel is presented to us in the Word. In its earlier periods these two functions were concentrated in one person, who acted as both priest and king, and of this we have evident traces in Homer and Hesiod.

But eventually, on account of the wars and idolatries of that people, the functions were separated, and rulers presided over the civil, and priests over the religious affairs of the nation. They were subsequently united again in Eli and Samuel, but still the genius of the people was so corrupt that the representation under this form could not well stand, and therefore it pleased the Divine Wisdom that a marked separation should again take place, and the Divine truth be represented by kings, and the Divine good by priests. The division of the kingdom, at a still later period into that of Judah and of Israel was providentially ordered with reference to the same representative import, the kingdom of Judah denoting good, and that of Israel truth.\* On the same

---

\* "In the representative church amongst the posterity of Jacob, there was first a kingdom of judges, afterwards a kingdom of priests, and lastly a kingdom of kings, and by the kingdom of judges was represented Divine Truth from Divine Good; but by the kingdom of priests, who were also judges, was represented Divine Good from which Divine Truth is derived; and by the kingdom of kings was represented Divine Truth without Divine Good; but when something of the priesthood was adjoined also to the regal [office], then was also represented by kings the Divine Truth, in which there was so much of good as there was of the priesthood adjoined to the regal office. All these things were instituted in the Jewish Church, that by them might be represented states of heaven, for in heaven there are two kingdoms, one which is called the celestial kingdom, and the other which is called the spiritual kingdom; the celestial kingdom is what is called the priesthood, and the spiritual kingdom what is called the royalty of the

ground it undoubtedly is, that in the Divine providence a similar disjunction has taken place and been long perpetuated in the world, whereby the officers of religious and civil life are universally distinct, constituting the two great departments of life, action, and interest. It is here that we recognize the reason why the main aspect induced upon the nations of the earth is *political* instead of *ecclesiastical*, for in the outset we learn that men were associated together as *churches*, and not as *kingdoms*. The predominance of the *secular* over the *sacred* in this way shows the corresponding prevalence of *truth* over *good*. As this inversion of states had previously found place in men's interiors, it was therefore of the Divine wisdom that the institutions and polities under which they lived should be accommodated to the perverted exigencies of their condition. But just in proportion as the moral state of mankind is wrought upon and renovated by the new influences that are being brought to bear upon it—just as the multiform evils of the existing order of things are got rid of—just in that proportion will there be a re-union or re-conjunction of these two functions, the *sacerdotal* and the *magisterial*, for the simple reason that there will be a more intimate union of the good and the truth which they respectively represent. Every man will be becoming more and more his own priest, as will every man his own physician, and his own lawyer. The lawyers of the more advanced eras of the church's development will answer more fully to the designation as employed in the New Testament, where it is applied to those who search into and expound the Divine law instead of the countless complexities of human codes.

But to return to the words of our text, "Ye shall be

---

Lord; in the latter Divine Truth reigns, in the former Divine Good; and whereas the representative of the celestial kingdom began to perish, when they sought a king, therefore on this occasion, that the representative of the Lord's kingdom in the heavens might still be continued, the Jews were separated from the Israelites, and by the Jewish kingdom was represented the celestial kingdom of the Lord, and by the Israelitish kingdom His spiritual kingdom."—A. C. 8770.

unto me a kingdom of priests," &c. We have already remarked that this language never received a literal accomplishment even in the best days of the Jewish commonwealth, when they came the nearest to that life of obedience which was the condition of its being fulfilled to them. The priesthood, instead of being diffused over the whole people in common, was restricted to one family, and one line, whose prerogative, in this respect, was guarded by the most explicit provisions and the most fearful sanctions. How then was the promise realized in its comprehensive import to that people? How were the sons of Jacob, as a whole, ever made a "kingdom of priests?" Was it, in fact, ever fulfilled to *them* at all? Even if we admit that to the truly and interiorly *good* among them there was an intrinsic applicability of the term, yet of what a mere fraction of the race have we reason to suppose this would hold good? Are we not forced, by the tone and tenor of their history, to deny to them, as a body, the blessing of the promise, and to look a long way onward and downward for the actual accomplishment of what is truly intended by the burden of the words?

Nothing is more obvious than that a multitude of things set forth in the Old Testament received their fulfillment in the New. So, in the present case, the proper way is to view the words as applicable to all true Christians under the New Testament, and especially under the New Dispensation, in whom they receive a more full, and adequate, and signal accomplishment. Let the casket of the literal Israel be conceived as opened, and the pearls of the Lord's New Church appear. Let us travel onwards with Isaiah and all the prophets to the happier times of the New Economy, and read in the epistle of Peter the coincident language which proves that the true Christians of his own and subsequent ages are the real subjects of the promise here made. "Unto you therefore which believe he is precious, but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner. And a stone



of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed. But ye are a chosen generation, *a royal priesthood*, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.”\* Here we have Peter, whom so many so-called Christians would make out the primate of the Church—Peter, whose pretended successors have continued to exalt themselves to the throne, and to trample the people in the dust—this same Peter makes over to all good Christians the title of priests, and so far from arrogating to himself any peculiar pre-eminence on account of what the Lord said to him respecting his being the Rock on which the Church was built, he obviously makes Christ the Rock, and says that they are “lively stones built up unto Him” as the true basis on which the Church rests. It may not be necessary to suppose that the apostle understood the full force of his own language, but to those who are possessed of the true “key of knowledge” the phrase “lively stones” conveys the idea of living truths, or truths personified and embodied in the spiritually living men of the Church.

We see then here developed the grand truth of our text, that those who obey the Lord’s voice, and keep his covenant, become to him a peculiar treasure, and a kingdom of priests. Accordant with this both in letter and in spirit is the language of Isaiah and of John. Is. lxi. 4-6: “And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the

---

\* “To be a peculium (or a peculiar people) signifies to be the Lord’s, for a peculium denotes property, and thus possession, and it denotes that in such case Divine Truth would appertain to them above others. The reason why they who have the Word are a peculium, and a property above others, is, because they know the truths and goods of faith, and, in consequence, can live the life of heaven, and be thereby more especially conjoined with the Lord than others; for the good which makes heaven with man has its quality from the truth of faith, thus good becomes more celestial or more divine, with those who have genuine truths, which are truths from the Word, supposing they are kept.”—A. C. 8768.

waste cities, the desolations of many generations. And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your ploughmen and your vine-dressers. But ye shall be named the *priests of the Lord*; men shall call you the *ministers of our God*: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves." Ver. 21: "And I will also take of them for *priests* and for *Levites*, saith the Lord." Rev. i. 5, 6: "And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful Witness, and the First-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, And hath made us *kings and priests* unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."

What can be understood from this but that the internal spiritual prerogative indicated by the name and answering to the outward function accrues or inures to every one, even the humblest disciple in the Lord's kingdom, just so far as he is in the spirit of obedience to the Divine voice, and in the keeping of the covenant which Jehovah hath ordained? Our previous explanations leave it beyond doubt as to what is interiorly conveyed in the purport of the term. By a priest is implied the good of love, and by a king, truth, and by the conjunction of the two is denoted that these two principles are to be found in union in those who come by their lives into the sphere of the Lord's peculium. As it was predicted of the Lord himself that he should sit as a *priest* on his *throne*, that is, uniting the royal and sacerdotal dignity in himself, so is it to be, in their measure, with his true people, *and with all of them*. This is confirmed by the words of the apostle when he says of Christians that they "have received an *unction* from the Holy One," compared with the Divine declaration, "for their *anointing* shall surely be an *everlasting priesthood* throughout all their generation."

As then we have it upon divine authority that every good man is a priest and a king in a spiritual sense, so

under the present dispensation we are taught to recognize *no other* priesthood than that which is spiritual. What other is there? Was not the Jewish priesthood representative? And has not the coming of the Lord abolished representatives? Is any thing more obvious in the writings of Swedenborg than that the representatives of the Jewish system have all passed away, and that we have come into the very reality of the thing signified? Baptism and the Lord's Supper were retained, and these only.

"Washings and many such like things were commanded and enjoined upon the house of Israel, because the church instituted with them was a representative church, and this was such that it prefigured the Christian church which was to come. Wherefore when the Lord came into the world, He abrogated the representatives, which were all external, and instituted a church, of which all things should be internal: thus the Lord put away the figures, and revealed the effigies themselves; as one removes a veil or opens a door, and causes the things within not only to be seen, but also to be approached. Of all these things the Lord retained only two, which should contain, in one complex, all things of the internal church; which two things are Baptism instead of washings, and the Holy Supper instead of the Lamb."—*T. C. R.* 670.

"The representatives of internal things ceased by the coming of the Lord. The case herein is like that of the soul or spirit of man and his body; the soul or spirit of a man is his internal, and the body is the external; or, what is the same thing, the soul or spirit is the very effigy of the man, but the body is its representative image: when the man rises again, then the representative image, or his external, which is the body, is put off; for then he is in the internal, or the very effigy itself."—*A. C.* 4835.

In the transition from the Old to the New System, the Temple, the Priest, the Altar, the Laver, the Incense, and the Sacrifice have all vanished away, and the Lord himself stands forth "sufficient and alone" the exclusive Priest, Prophet, King, Head, and Husband, of his church.

Yet we have but to turn over the page of history to see that this great truth has been grievously lost sight of, and a raging propensity evinced to return again to the

old antiquated and superannuated idea of priesthood. Accordingly, if we enter the precincts of the Roman Catholic Church, we find the leading features of the Jewish system completely reproduced. There is the Priest, and the Altar, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and, to crown the whole, there is the Arch-Pontiff, the Grand High Priest of the Christian Church, its Supreme Head, which gives visible unity to the whole body. This polity is sustained by a specious kind of reasoning, which is in effect not unfrequently enlisted in behalf of general conventions or synods, that stand virtually in the same relation to the body of the church as does an individual pope. The *principle* is by no means confined to the papacy. It is maintained more or less in all churches in which the *esprit du corps*, or spirit of sect, is strong. But in whatever form it exists—whether of Pope, Bishop, Council, Conference, Convention, or Assembly, it is in effect the same, and is utterly and eternally abhorrent to the true genius of the true church.

But however clear and unequivocal the principles above enunciated, there is still with the advocates of a Christian Priesthood a persistent leaning upon *representatives* which goes to nullify the force of all we have thus far said on the subject. "There were surely priests," it is objected, "under the old dispensation, and if they did not represent priests under the new, what did they represent?" We have already replied to this, that the celestial element in heaven and the church is that which the priestly function was designed to represent, as is the spiritual that which is bodied forth by kings. By these two classes of persons was represented then the two distinct but intimately related *principles* of good and truth, and when these principles entered, at the first coming of the Lord, upon a more substantial development in the church, the representatives themselves were formally abolished, just as a shadow disappears when the meridian sun shines perpendicularly down upon the object which caused it. The proof of this we have already given. If now we admit, what is so clear-

ly taught in the writings of the New Church, that these *principles* were foreshadowed in these types, we are bound to consider the import of the representatives exhausted in them, unless we are furnished with some express intimation to the contrary. If it be affirmed that priestly persons under the Levitical economy represented an order of men devoted to ecclesiastical functions under the old or new Christian dispensation, we are at liberty to demand the authority for the position, which we have never yet been so happy as to meet with. At the same time, we are far from holding that the above-mentioned principles exist as mere floating abstractions. They are principles that are embodied—and embodied too in living men of the Church, but not in a so-termed distinct clerical order, contra-distinguished from the laity, as was the Levitical tribe among the Jews from the other tribes. Such a distinction we affirm to be unknown to the teachings of the Christian dispensation. Still the sacerdotal good and the regal truth are essential elements of the church, and must be operative in the persons of its members. One may have a predominance of one principle, and another of the other, but they are both found, in some degree, in *every* member, and no such thing is possible, on orderly grounds, as a restriction or appropriation of the priestly function, for instance, to a particular class, to the exclusion of others. All are priests, in some measure, and on this basis, the church is constituted an universal ministry. This, however, is in no way inconsistent with a special ministry or teaching function to be exercised by those in whom these principles shall assert or pronounce themselves with peculiar emphasis and force, and in whom they shall be recognized and acknowledged by others. I am aware that many find it difficult even to *understand* what is meant by a “teaching minister,” when he is viewed otherwise than as pertaining to a distinct clerical order. But the distinction is intrinsically intelligible, and will be more easily understood in proportion as the church emerges from the false position in which it is now held

captive, as it were, by reason of its long and unquestioning wont to priestly ideas and institutions. It is difficult indeed for one to see the false while he is mainly in it. How is the mind of a native monarchist taxed to conceive adequately of the state of things under a republic? How next to impossible for a minion of the Romish hierarchy to entertain the idea of church-freedom with which we are all familiar in America? Yet when the kingly or priestly institution is subjected to a rigid inquest into its ground or authority, how does the evidence vanish into thin air?

In the present case, we deny the legitimate existence of a priesthood in the New Christian Church, from the utter absence of all positive proof in its favor. That mention is indeed made of priests again and again in the writings of Swedenborg is unquestionable, but the context will almost invariably show that the church to which his priests pertain is not the church of the New Jerusalem, which was then but just commencing, but the church of Christendom of which he spake as it was, and to which he freely conceded a certain degree of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, and that too as received through the medium of the laying on of hands in ordination. It is we conceive of this priesthood or clergy that he speaks when he says, that the Divine proceeding passes "through men to men, and *in the church chiefly from the clergy to the laity.*" So again when he says (A. R. 567) that the clergy are in the internals, and the laity in the externals, of the church. We perceive in this and several kindred passages of the same work, no reference to the New Church, but solely to the church that preceded it. The same is to be said of the oft-cited passage, T. C. R. 146, in which our author affirms that "the divine virtue and operation which is signified by the Holy Spirit consists, *with the clergy in particular*, in illustration and instruction, the reason of which is that they belong to their office, and inauguration into the ministry brings them along with it." One has but to read the whole section connectedly to see that its reference is

primarily to the clergy of the old church, who were in imminent danger of mistaking a fiery zeal for a divine inspiration. It will be observed too that they are spoken of in a highly derogatory and oburgatory vein, as embracing among them deniers of God and despisers of the Word, Jesuits, enthusiasts, and Lucifers—predicates that we can by no means believe applicable to the truly illustrated and instructed man of the New Church. It is, moreover, obvious from a multitude of passages in other parts of the writings that true illustration is the privilege, not of an ordained or inaugurated clergy only, but of all who are in a suitable state to receive it. The following are to the point :

“*Everyone* is illustrated and informed from the Word according to the affection of truth, and the degree of the desire thereof, and according to the faculty of receiving.”—*A. C.* 9382.

“The Lord leads those who love truths, and will them from Himself; all such are enlightened when they read the Word, for the Lord is the Word, and speaks *with every one* according to his comprehension. Men are enlightened variously, every one according to the quality of his affection and consequent intelligence. They who are in the spiritual affection of truth are elevated into the light of heaven so as to perceive the illustration.”—*A. E.* 1183.

“They are in illustration, when they read the Word, who are in the affection of truth for the sake of truth, and for the sake of the good of life: and not they who are in the affection of truth for the sake of self-glory, of reputation, or of gain.”—*A. C.* 9382, 10,548, 10,551, *Index*.

“The divine truth is the Word, and they who are of that church (the New Church) are illustrated from the spiritual light of the Word by influx out of heaven from the Lord, and this by reason that they acknowledge the Divine (principle) in the human of the Lord, and from Him are in the spiritual affection of truth: by these and no others is spiritual light received, which continually flows in through heaven from the Lord with all who read the Word; hence is their illustration.”—*A. E.* 759.

With these paragraphs before us it would seem impossible to perceive any special restriction of the privilege of illustration to the clergy. It is set forth as the prerogative of all those who are in the affection of truth for

the truth's sake. So far then as this spiritual illustration is a criterion of clerical character, we are to recognize that character as existing wherever the illustration exists; and this is surely not among any one class of the men of the church. The clerical function evidently depends upon states of mind or life, and not upon official designation or inaugurating rites. The office properly resides with men of special qualifications, and those qualifications are not transmitted, however they may be recognized, by any particular form of induction. We are all aware of the great stress laid upon a passage in the "Canons," in which it is said that the Divine proceeding, which is called the Holy Spirit, passes in the Church chiefly from the clergy to the laity, and that the clergy, because they are to teach doctrine from the Word, are to be inaugurated by the promise (*sponsionem, covenant*) of the Holy Spirit, and by the representation of its translation, though it is to be, or will be, received by the clergy according to the faith of their life, by which we suppose is meant the quality of their life as governed by their faith. In this, however, we see nothing inconsistent with what might properly be said in reference to an existing order of things in the Christian Church in Swedenborg's time, and without any special allusion to the economy of the church of the New Jerusalem, which was subsequently to be established. And we are confirmed in this by the fact, that in the view which Swedenborg gives us of the influx that accompanies illustration—that illustration which shall enable a man to teach doctrine, for, "to be illustrated through heaven from the Lord is to be illustrated by the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit is the Divine proceeding from the Lord"—we see nothing that limits it particularly to the clergy.

"It may be expedient briefly to say in what manner influx is effected by which is illustration: the angels, alike with men, perceive the Word when it is read, but the angels spiritually and men naturally. The man whose internal is open also perceives the Word spiritually, but this he is ignorant of while he lives in the world; because his spiritual thought flows in into the natural in the external man, and



there presents itself to be seen ; nevertheless that interior thought is what illustrates, and by which is effected the influx from the Lord."—*A. C.* 10,551.

It will be hard to detect anything exclusively official in this, and so also of the extract which follows :

"Immediate revelation is not given, unless what has been in the Word, which revelation, as delivered by the prophets and evangelists, and in the historical parts of the Word, is such, that *every one* may be taught according to the affections of his love, and the consequent thoughts of his understanding. Illustration is as follows : light conjoined to heat flows in through heaven from the Lord ; this heat, which is divine love, affects the will, whence man has the affection of good ; and this light, which is divine wisdom, affects the understanding, whence man has the thought of truth."—*A. E.* 1177.

That this is the common privilege of all good men in the church, and belongs primarily to them, is to be inferred from the phraseology in *T. C. R.* 146, before cited, in which it is said that the divine operation, reformation, regeneration, renovation, vivification, sanctification, justification, purification, remission of sins, and finally salvation, flow in from the Lord, *as well with the clergy as with the laity*. If the clergy had been principal in this matter we should have expected this to read in the reverse order, "as well with the *laity* as with the *clergy*." How obvious the conclusion that the laity are the primary recipients of these operations, and that the information needed by the reader was that the clergy participated with them in the reception. The drift of the language is clearly to guard against the impression that the operations in question were confined to the laity. But how incongruous would it be to put the statement in this form on the supposition that the clergy were of course to take precedence in this matter ? What would be the natural inference if one in describing the worship of a Christian Church should say that the choir, as well as the congregation, took part in the chanting ? What else would be implied by this but that the congregation at large was the party which was understood ordinarily to take the

lead in this service? And that the clause respecting the choir was designed to supply information which would otherwise be lacking.

In our remarks above on the celebrated passage in the "Canons" respecting the communication or transmission of the Holy Spirit, or the Divine Proceeding, we have offered some reasons for questioning the common application of our author's words. We deem ourselves, indeed, forbidden to apply the Canon above cited to a sacerdotal or clerical order from the fact that Swedenborg characterizes the tenet of succession of ordinations into the ministry as an "elevation from the love of dominion over the holy things of the church, and over heaven, grounded in self-love, which is the devil; as is also the transferring of the Holy Spirit from one man to another," *A. R.* 802. We of course admit that this is spoken originally and directly of the succession of the vicarship of Christ and the Priesthood in the Papacy, but are still constrained to recognize in it a *principle* in effect acted upon in the New Church, when it is held that the clergy perpetuate their own order by manual or "tactual" succession. This principle we understand Swedenborg to repudiate; and from the following, with other passages of his works, we infer that the genuine order of transmission is rather from the so-called laity to the so-called clergy than the reverse.

"When the Levites were purified, and the ministry of the priesthood under Aaron was ascribed to them, it was commanded that two bullocks should be brought, with a meat offering, and that Aaron should bring the Levites before Jehovah, and *the sons of Israel should lay their hands upon the Levites*, Num. viii. 7. By the sons of Israel laying their hands upon the Levites, was signified the translation of the power of ministering for them, and reception by the Levites, thus separation."

Here is the recognition of an original inherent right in the people at large to minister for themselves, but for adequate reasons an economy was to be established, under which the exercise of this right, in their own persons, was to be waived as a general fact, and the function

discharged by proxy. It does not appear that this amounted to an actual divesting of the people of the right, but rather to a simple foregoing, for the sake of peculiar advantages, of a prerogative with which they were originally endowed. Now, when we look at this Levitical institute in its representative import, we read in it the pre-intimation of that order which we have all along held forth as the genuine order of the New Church, to wit, that while *all* the members of the church are spiritually priests and kings, and thus every one potentially a church in the least form, yet the advanced states of some on the score of intelligence and affection qualify them in a superior degree to act as leaders and teachers of their brethren, and that, consequently, it is perfectly competent for these brethren, without the least reference to any pre-existing ordained authority in the church, to acknowledge such endowed individuals as acting for them in this leading capacity. This they can do without such teachers being thereby constituted into a distinct order or caste, as the clergy are usually regarded. Nor is an institute in this way created which shall operate as a release of the mass of believers from all responsibility on the score of effort in building up, in the principles of the church, that particular society with which they may chance to be connected. If it is deemed desirable that the ordaining rite should be administered in such cases to represent just that kind of vice-agent function which we have described, so be it; we know of nothing to render it improper, though at the same time we see nothing to make it imperative. But, if done, let it be understood as denoting a transmission or communication from the people to their substituted ministers, and not from one *jure divino* clergyman to another. Let it, moreover, ever be borne in mind, that Aaron, his sons, and the Levites, represent primarily principles, and persons only so far as persons may be necessary to embody those principles. Wherever the principles exist in the proper degree, there the persons are found, provided they are acknowledged in that character, as they will

scarcely fail to be, where a genuine affection of truth exists; and as to ordination or inauguration, the illustrating influx is always to be viewed as preceding and not following it, and nothing is clearer from the writings of the New Church than that this influx, which is confined to no one class, carries with it all competent authority to teach.

We object, therefore, to the restricted application of the above Canon to the so-called clergy, from the fact, that evidence exists in abundance, going to show that the "teaching of doctrine from the Word" is the duty of every member of the church, just in proportion as he understands it, and is prompted by the love of charitable use to declare it. But as in this position I shall undoubtedly appear to run counter to an express injunction of our enlightened author, it will be expedient to present that injunction distinctly in this connection.

"Good may be insinuated into another by every one in the country; but not truth, except those who are teaching ministers (*ministri docentes*); if others insinuate truth, it gives birth to heresies, and the church is disturbed and rent asunder. Every one should first acquire truth to himself from the doctrine of the church, and afterward from the Word of the Lord, and this truth must be the object of his faith."—A. C. 6822.

On this passage it may be remarked, that its genuine scope can only be determined by viewing it in its relations to the context. It occurs in a series of articles appended to several chapters of the exposition of Exodus, in which the author is treating at considerable length of the doctrine of Charity. In his definitions of neighbor he informs us that the term is not to be restricted to a single individual but has an ascending purport, implying successively an individual, a society, a man's country, the church, the Lord's kingdom, and the Lord Himself. On each of these heads he expatiates somewhat fully, showing the laws of charity in reference to each, and the grounds upon which they rest. The passage in question occurs in what is said of the *church* as a neighbor, but

in the use of the term "country," we recognize an allusion to what had been just before affirmed respecting the neighbor viewed in that capacity. Otherwise we see not clearly how to account for the peculiar phraseology employed: "Good may be insinuated into another by every one *in the country*." "By every one *in the church*" would seem to have been the more natural expression, provided the sense commonly ascribed to the language be the true one. But taken in its relations, the idea we receive from it is, that while every citizen of a country is a *minister* or *servant* to the community in which he dwells, and bound to promote its interests, secular or sacred, yet all are not equally qualified for every department of service. In whatever concerns the inculcation of good, no restriction is enjoined. Every one, without exception, is at full liberty to do all in his power towards insinuating this divine principle into the minds of his fellow-men. But in regard to truth, or that system of religious doctrines which is usually understood by the term, the case is otherwise; there, while there is a general duty of imparting religious truth in an informal way, and according to the measure of attainment, yet it is more expedient and more orderly that this function should be systematically discharged by those who are *ministri*, i. e., *ministers* or *servants* of a higher degree, to wit, *ministri docentes* or *teaching ministers*—a class of men not necessarily constituted into a distinct order, but men possessed of certain qualifications, enabling them to perform this use to better advantage than others, because from their longer acquaintance with the doctrines, from their deeper study of them, and from their conjoining with their doctrines an exemplary life, their instructions would naturally have more weight. The distinction to which we allude is, perhaps, recognized in the following passage: "By the Lord's disciples are meant those who are instructed by the Lord in the goods and truths of doctrine; but by apostles they who, after they are instructed, teach them," *A. R.* 79. We shall soon proceed to show that this is the true representative function

of apostles, and also of prophets. With those persons in a community who were less conversant with the truth in its various bearings, there would be more liability to crude conceptions and enunciations, by which heresies might be engendered, and "confusion and every evil work" ensue. Let, then, the formal teaching of truth devolve more especially upon those whom the Lord, by a longer training in his school, has qualified to take the lead in the instruction of their fellow-men, and who have thus been empowered to act as *ministri docentes* to their fellow-christians. The ability with which they are gifted to perform the office, and the recognition of this ability on the part of their brethren, is what constitutes the essence of the appointment. These "teaching ministers," i. e. servants, having been peculiarly taught of God, are thereby qualified to teach their novitiate brethren, and these latter are inhibited from exercising the function simply from their present inability to do it with advantage to the cause. The words, however, do not imply so much an imperative veto as a dehortation appealing to the modesty and good sense of the neophytes of the church not to "meddle with things too high for them." As they advance in spiritual knowledge and experience, they will grow in the teaching capacity, and thus be enabled in due time to take the place of their elders. Accordingly, it is said in the extract under consideration, "*Every one* ought first to acquire truth to himself from the doctrine of the church, and afterwards from the Word of the Lord, and this truth must be the object of his faith." That is, he is first to acquire truth before he undertakes to teach—before he can justly lay claim to the character of a "teaching minister"—for all such are to officiate on the ground of their superior aptitude for discharging the duty, and not by virtue of any instituting or inaugurating rite.

It is thus that we are forced to understand the drift of the paragraph cited, and we now proceed to adduce our reasons, in the form of a series of distinct quotations, for believing that any other mode of interpreting the pas-

sage brings our author into the most pointed contradiction to himself. And here we add an explanatory remark.

It will no doubt appear a problem why we refuse to receive the various passages from Swedenborg usually cited in support of a priesthood in that sense which they seem to bear on their face, and in which they have always been received and acted upon in the New Church. To this we reply, that it is for the simple reason that it would make Swedenborg inconsistent with himself. To our mind nothing is clearer than that the general tenor of his writings is at variance with the literal import of the specific paragraphs in question. This apparent discrepancy is never alluded to, nor would seem ever to be recognized by the opposite school, but it is exceedingly plain to us, and we feel bound to adopt such a construction of the author's language as will at least make him consistent with himself. That which we have indicated above is to our own minds satisfactory on this score; if others dissent they no doubt feel competent to assign valid reasons therefor, and such reasons we shall always feel bound candidly to weigh.

We have already dwelt at length upon the position that the priests and Levites of the Jewish dispensation represented principles and not persons. The Apostles of the New Testament have a like representative import.

"By the twelve apostles are represented and signified *all in the church who are in truths derived from good*; thus also, all truths derived from good from which the church is; and by each apostle in particular is represented and signified some specific principle. Thus, by Peter is represented and signified faith; by James, charity; and by John, the good of charity, or the good of love."—*A. E.* 8.

We need not say how incongruous would be the institution of a trinal order of persons on the ground of this statement, and yet, why is there not as much warrant for it as for the appointment of such an order on the ground of the representative character of Aaron, the Priests, and the Levites under the old economy?

"By the apostles are signified *those who teach the truths of the church*."—*A. E.* 100.

“Apostles are so called because they are sent to teach, and to evangelize concerning the Lord; hence it appears what is meant by apostles in the Word, namely, not the twelve apostles who were sent by the Lord to teach concerning Him and His Kingdom, *but all those who are in the truths of the church.*”—*Id.*

“By the twelve disciples are represented *all who are principled in goods and truths from the Lord.*”—*A. C.* 9942.

“By apostles are not understood apostles, but *all who teach the goods and truths of the church.*”—*A. R.* 79.

“Here, then, we have the representative bearing of the twelve apostles, and not a syllable occurs to show that they were intended to shadow forth a distinct order of men apart from the general brotherhood of the church. It is palpable that they denote *all* those who, by being indoctrinated and principled in the goods and truths of the church, are made capable of imparting them to others, or, in other words, of becoming “teaching ministers.”

The representative significance of prophets is equivalent to that of apostles, to wit, that of teachers of truth; and Swedenborg remarks in regard to priests that their office was that of “explaining the law divine, and teaching, *on which occasion they were at the same time prophets.*” The work, therefore, of imparting doctrinal truth clothes one spiritually with the prophetic character.

“To prophecy signifies to teach in the Word, because by a prophet, in the supreme sense, is understood the Lord as to the Word. *Hence by prophesying is signified to teach the Word and doctrine from the Word.*”—*A. E.* 624.

“So in Amos, iii. 7, 8: ‘Surely the Lord Jehovah will not do a word without revealing his secret unto his servants the prophets. The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord Jehovah hath spoken, who can but prophecy?’ Here by the Lord Jehovah not doing a word without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets, is signified, that the Lord *opens the interior things of the word and of doctrine to those who are in truths from good*; by revealing his secret are signified the illustration and opening of the interior things of the Word; by his servants the prophets, are signified *those who are in the truths of doctrine, and who receive.*”—*A. E.* 601.



"By priests are understood those who teach life and lead to good, and by prophets those who teach truths by which they are to be led—in a word, *prophets are to teach, and priests to lead.*"—*A. E.* 624.

"By the prophets mentioned here (Ezek. xiii. 2, 3, 8) and in other parts of the Word, are understood in the spiritual sense all who *are led by the Lord*, for with them the Lord flows in and reveals to them the arcana of the Word, whether they teach them or not, wherefore such are signified by prophets in the spiritual sense."—*A. E.* 624.

Such, then, is the spiritual import of apostles and prophets in the writings of the New Church; and as that church is a spiritual church, it is doubtless a spiritual office which is designated by these terms. The function indicated is, indeed, to be performed *more especially* by a class of men peculiarly adapted, from interior endowments and elevated states, to the work, but still not so exclusively by them as absolutely to preclude all others, and thus to lay a claim to a monopoly of the use. This, we should suppose, could hardly be maintained in their behalf with such passages as the following before our eyes—passages that evidently apply to every one who professes to be governed by the laws of the Lord's kingdom. Their drift, it will be seen, is to inculcate the communication of truth and good as an exercise of spiritual charity. In the spiritual sense *feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, and clothing the naked*, is but another mode of conveying the idea of this very duty.

"By Jesus saying three times to Peter, 'Lovest thou me?' and Peter saying three times, 'I love thee,' and Jesus then saying, 'Feed my lambs,' and 'Feed my sheep,' is signified, that *they who are in faith derived from love ought to instruct those who are in the good of love to the Lord, and in the good of charity towards their neighbor*; for they who are in faith derived from love are also in truths, and they who are thence in truths, instruct concerning good and lead to good."—*A. E.* 9.

"By giving a cup of cold water to the little ones is signified to teach truth from spiritual innocence, and also to instruct the innocent in truths."—*A. E.* 624.

"If thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul; then shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the

noon day,' Is. lviii. 10. In these words is described the exercise of charity towards the neighbor, in this case towards those who are in ignorance and at the same time desirous of knowing truths, and grieved on account of the falsities which occupy the mind; and that with those who are in that charity, falsities shall be shaken off, and truths give light and shine. Charity towards those who are in ignorance, and who at the same time are desirous of knowing truths, is understood by 'if thou draw out thy soul to the hungry,' the hungry denoting those who desire, and soul denoting the intelligence of truth instructing. That it is thus to instruct those who are grieved on account of the falsities which occupy the mind, is signified by 'and satisfy the afflicted soul;' that with those who are in such charity, ignorance shall be dissipated, and truths shine, and give light, is understood by, 'then shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noon day.' Obscurity signifies the ignorance of the spiritual mind, and darkness the ignorance of the natural mind; light signifies truth in the light, in like manner noon day. *In such illumination are they who, from charity, or spiritual affection, instruct those who are in falsities from ignorance,* for that charity is the receptacle of the influx of light or truth from the Lord. Again: 'Is not this the fast which I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that ye bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh,' lviii. 6, 7. Similar things are understood by these words: for, by dealing bread to the hungry, is signified that from charity they should communicate to and instruct those who are in ignorance, and who at the same time are desirous of knowing truths. To bring the poor that are cast out into the house, signifies to amend and restore those who are in falsities, and thence in grief."—A. E. 386.

"I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in.' Here by hungering and thirsting are signified to be in ignorance and in spiritual want, and by giving to eat and drink, are signified to instruct and to enlighten from spiritual affection or charity; wherefore it is also said, 'I was a stranger, and ye took me in,' for by stranger is signified those who are out of the church, and desire to be instructed and receive the doctrines thereof, and live according to them."—A. E. 386.

"In the Word where mention is made of borrowing and lending, it signifies to be instructed and to instruct, from the affection of charity; as in Matt. v. 42, 'Give to every one that asketh of thee, and from him that is desirous to borrow of thee, turn not thou away.' By asking and desiring to borrow, and by giving and receiving what is borrowed, is meant the communication of celestial goods, which are the knowledges of good and truth."—A. C. 9174.

“Lending denotes to *communicate the goods of heaven from the affection of charity, thus to instruct* those who being in ignorance of truth, and yet in the desire of learning, *ought to be instructed.*”—A. C. 9209.

Who can gainsay the inference which we draw from this, that the duty of teaching, and that, too, of teaching “doctrines from the Word,” is actually incumbent upon every one who is amenable to the Lord’s laws of charity? How is it possible to restrict this duty to a clerical caste, or to suppose that Swedenborg would so stultify himself as absolutely to forbid the insinuation or inculcation of truth to all save a consecrated class in the church? At the same time, we perceive nothing in this view inconsistent with a more special office of instruction to be exercised by those who are best qualified for it. This office, if we mistake not, was particularly represented by the Levites, who had no inheritance assigned them among the tribes, but who were scattered, as a kind of leaven of charitable use, throughout the mass of the people. The general significance of that tribe is spiritual love or charity going forth in good works towards the neighbor.

“The reason why the tribe of Levi signifies good works is, because spiritual love or charity consists in performing goods, which are good works; essential charity, viewed in itself, is the affection of truth and good, and where that affection is, there is a life according to truths and goods, for affection without a life according to the truths and goods, with which it is affected has no existence. Spiritual affection has for its end the Lord, heaven, and life eternal, which it regards in the truths and goods; thus it loves truths and goods spiritually, and when this affection has place with man, he then loves to think those things, and to will them, consequently to live according to them. To live according to goods and truths is understood in the Word by doing, and the life itself, by the deeds and works which are so often mentioned in the Word: these therefore are what were represented and signified by Levi and his tribe in the church with the Jews. Inasmuch as this affection is the very essential principle of the church, therefore the tribe of Levi was made the priesthood; and therefore the staff of Levi in the tent of the assembly blossomed with almonds; and for the same reason, to that tribe was given an inheritance, not in the same manner as to the other tribes, but amongst each of them. The reason why the priesthood was given to the tribe of Levi was, because it represented, and thence signified, love and charity. Love and charity constitute the affection of spiritual good and truth; for affection being

the continuous principle of love, is predicated of love in its continuity. The same is also signified in the Word by the priesthood and its ministry, this affection being the essential principle of the church, since where it is, there is the church, and where it is not, the church is not ; for the affection of good and truth is the very spiritual life of man, for when man is affected with good and truth, he is then in good and truth as to life, his thought itself being nothing but affection in a varied form, forasmuch as whatever a man thinks he derives from his affection, to think without affection being impossible. Hence then it may appear why the tribe of Levi was appointed to the priesthood."—*A. E.* 444.

The blossoming of the almonds of Aaron's rod is further explained in what follows :

"By almonds are signified the goods of charity, for by these all things relating to the church flourish in man, because when he possesses these, he possesses intelligence and faith, inasmuch as he is then in the affection of understanding what he knows from the Word, and in the will of acting according to it."—*A. E.* 444.

So also the fact of their not receiving separate inheritance among the other tribes has its significance unfolded in the same connexion.

"Inasmuch as in all things relating to the church there must be the good of charity, in order to the church being in them ; and inasmuch as the affection itself of good and truth, which is charity, gives the faculty of intelligence, and instructs all, therefore the tribe of Levi was not only appointed to the priesthood, but the inheritance granted to that tribe was *amongst all the other tribes*."—*A. E.* 444.

Comparing the above last cited paragraph with that which follows, we seem to ourselves to perceive a distinct intimation that the priesthood was not to constitute a separate order, but was to be an operative element of charity and good works pervading the entire body of the church.

"Inasmuch as the Lord as to all the work of salvation was represented by the high priest, and the work of salvation by his office, which is called the priesthood, therefore to Aaron and his sons was not given inheritance and portion among the people, for it is said that Jehovah God was to them an inheritance and a portion ; for the people represented heaven and the church, but Aaron with his sons and with the Levites represented the good of love and of faith, which makes heaven

and the church, thus the Lord from whom that good is derived ; therefore the land was ceded to the people for an inheritance, but not to the priests, *for the Lord is in them, but not amongst them as one and distinct.*" —A. C. 9809.

What can we gather from this but that the Levitical principle in the church, to wit, the good of love and the fruits of charity, is the most direct and pregnant representative of the Lord himself, and that this, as the very life of the church, is not to assume a distinct and isolated form, but is to be diffused as a vital element throughout the entire community of the church, as were the Levites in Israel ? As before remarked, we do not by this convey the idea that this Levitical principle exists as an abstraction, unimpersonated, unembodied in the church. Not at all ; we recognize it in the forms of living members of the church, who have so far progressed in the regenerate life, who have become so endowed with the gifts of knowledge and charity, that they are rendered capable of performing those spiritual uses to their brethren which were so strikingly shadowed forth by the functions of the sacred tribe in the literal Israel. What but this is the drift of the ensuing extracts :

" Inasmuch, as already observed, as every man learns science, intelligence, and wisdom, according to the affection of good and truth which he possesses, therefore it is also said in Moses, ' And the priests the sons of Levi shall come near ; for them Jehovah thy God hath chosen to minister unto him, and to bless in the name of Jehovah, and by their word shall every controversy and every stroke be tried,' Deut. xxi. 5. By these words in the spiritual sense, is signified, that the affection of good and truth, which is charity, *ministers to the Lord, and teaches those things which pertain to the church and to worship, and distinguishes falsities from truths, and evils from goods ;* for by the sons of Levi, in the spiritual sense, is signified the affection of good and truth, which is charity. From these observations it may appear, that the tribe of Levi was chosen for the priesthood, and had an inheritance among all the tribes, not because that tribe was better than the other tribes, but because it represented charity in act, and good works, which are the effects of all good and truth in man."—A. E. 444.

" Whereas the sons of Levi signify the goods and truths of the church, and in general, the spiritual affection of truth and good, there-

fore it is said concerning them, ' they have observed thy word, and kept thy covenant ; they shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law ; ' by which is signified that *they who are in the spiritual affection of truth act according to the Word, and teach the goods and truths of the church*, for the spiritual affection itself of truth is what does and teaches, inasmuch as the Lord flows into that affection, effecting good in man, and teaching him truth : the Word in this passage signifying the divine truth, and to observe it obviously signifying to act according to it, or to do what it commands. These things are said concerning Levi, because divine truth, which is the Word, can exist only with those who are in the spiritual affection of truth, which affection consists in loving the truth itself, and esteeming it above every good of the world, because thereby man has life eternal, which cannot be implanted in him by any other means than by truths, consequently by the Word, for by the Word the Lord teaches truths."—*A. E.* 444.

" From these observations it may be seen what is signified in the representative sense by Levi and his tribe, namely, the good of charity, which is the good of life, likewise the spiritual affection of good and truth, and, in the supreme sense, the Lord as to spiritual love."—*A. E.* 444.

From the scope of these passages we know not for ourselves how to resist the conclusion, that the Levitical principle in the church does ultimate itself in that course of kindly pastoral care, instruction, and spiritual leading, which is the native impulse of the affection above described. To confine this to any exclusive order of men would be to prescribe an *ex officio* charity, which is as gross an anomaly as can be conceived.

There is no point in regard to which we are more anxious to have our views distinctly apprehended than that which respects the existence of a priesthood in the church. It is not the *fact* of a priesthood, but the *kind*, which is a matter of debate with us. We fully admit the existence of the institution, but we deny that it consists of a distinct order of men, standing out in relief from the body of the church, exclusively devoted to sacerdotal functions, and receiving temporal support therefrom as did the Jewish priests from the altar which they served. It is this particular feature of the prevailing theory of priesthood to which we object. We recognize no such distinction as now every where obtains be-

tween clergy and laity. We would retain every thing that is essential in the order, and reject every thing that is factitious. What we regard as such in both respects can hardly fail to appear from the tenor of what we have already said. When we deny the existence of an external priesthood in the church, we do not of course design to be understood as implying that the priesthood is not to be exercised by men in the flesh, and who are of course so far external, but we have constant reference to the above-mentioned distinction. Our meaning is, that we do not admit the existence of a priestly order as visibly distinct from the laical. The true priesthood, we contend, is to be sought for *in* the body of the laity, and not apart from it, and that it is to be identified by the possession of certain internal states and endowments represented by the priestly function under the Jewish dispensation. As we understand this external representative institute to be abolished under the dispensation of the New Jerusalem, we find no authority for any other priesthood than that to which we now allude, and this we feel at liberty to denominate spiritual, in contradistinction from the external and visible above described. We say this to cut off unequivocally from our opponents all possible occasion for charging us with a total and unqualified denial of a priesthood of any kind whatever in the New Church. We are well aware, however, that the distinction now made and insisted on will be resolutely ignored by some "of the contrary part," but it is nevertheless perfectly sound in itself, and clearly and intelligibly stated.

At the same time, we cannot be ignorant that this very position will be most strenuously oppugned. The earnest advocates for the opposite view admit no such construction of Swedenborg's language respecting the abrogation of representatives, as shall involve the doing away of the sacerdotal order in the church. A representative priesthood, it is contended, must always of necessity exist in the church, and that priesthood cannot really be a priesthood unless composed of men formed into a distinct and

privileged caste. This point has been elaborated at great length, and with signal ability, by the Rev. Mr. De Charms, in the "Newchurchman—Extra" (p. 416—473), but still with results to our minds wholly inconclusive. We cannot pursue the argument in detail, but its effect is, if we understand it, to vacate entirely the force of the following and many similar passages from our enlightened author.

"The Lord 'abolished the representatives of the Jewish nation, because the greatest part had respect to himself—for the image must vanish when the effigy itself appears. He established, therefore a new church, which should not be led, as the former was, by representatives to things internal, but which should know them without representatives.'"—*A. C.* 4904.

"When the Lord came into the world, then the externals which represented were abolished, because it was the Lord Himself whom the representatives of the church shadowed forth and signified, and whereas they were external things, and, as it were, veils or coverings, within which was the Lord, therefore when He came, these coverings were taken away, and He Himself appeared manifest with heaven and with the church, in which He is the all in all."—*A. E.* 700.

"By the ark is signified the representative of the church in general, in like manner as by the daily or continual [sacrifice] in Daniel, which was to cease at the Lord's coming into the world: in this sense it is mentioned in Jeremiah: 'I will give you pastors according to my heart, and they shall feed you with knowledge and intelligence; and it shall come to pass when ye shall be multiplied, and bear fruit in the land, in those days they shall no more say, the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, neither shall it come up upon the heart, nor shall they make mention thereof, neither shall they desire it, neither shall it be repaired any more,' iii. 15, 16. These things are said concerning the advent of the Lord, and concerning the abolition of the representative rites of the Jewish church which should then take place: that the interior things of the church should be manifested, which were veiled over by the representative external rites, and that they should then become interior or spiritual men, is signified by pastors being given according to the heart of the Lord, who shall feed them with knowledge and intelligence; by pastors are understood those who teach good and lead thereto by truths: the multiplication of truth and fructification of good, is signified by, then it shall come to pass, when ye shall be multiplied and bear fruit in the land in those days: that then conjunction with the Lord will be by the interior things of the Word and not by things exterior, which only signified and represented things interior, is



signified by, they shall no more say, the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, the ark of the covenant of Jehovah there denoting the externals of worship, which were then to be abolished, the same as by the daily or continual [sacrifice] which was to cease, as mentioned in Daniel, chap. viii. 13 ; chap. xi. 31 ; chap. xii. 11 : that there was to be no longer external worship, but internal, is signified by, it shall not come into the heart, neither shall they make mention thereof, neither shall they desire it, neither shall it be repaired any more."—*A. E.* 700.

"After the coming of the Lord, however, when external rites were abolished, and representatives consequently ceased, these were no longer changed in heaven into corresponding representatives ; for as man becomes internal, and is instructed in internal things, then externals are as nothing to him, for he then knows what is sacred, as charity, and the faith grounded therein. From these internal principles therefore his externals are now regarded, for the purpose of ascertaining how much of charity and of faith towards the Lord is in them. Wherefore, since the Lord's advent, man is no longer considered in heaven in reference to externals, but to internals ; and if any one be regarded as to his external, it is solely because he is in simplicity, and in this state has innocence and charity, which are introduced by the Lord into externals, or into his external worship, without his consciousness."—*A. C.* 1003.

All this would seem to be sufficiently explicit, and its scope is so palpably adverse to the prevalent idea of a representative priesthood continued under the New Dispensation, that it is no wonder that all the logical forces of the upholders of the priesthood are concentrated to the task of explaining away its obvious import. The onward march of the hierarchical argument is terribly impeded by this huge rock lying directly in the way, and unless it can be blasted, or tunneled, or triturated, or dissolved by some kind of dialectic acid, the whole host must come to a dead stand. We must say, in justice to Mr. D., that Hannibal never labored more industriously in applying his solvent to the granite of the Alps, to effect a passage for his troops, than does our esteemed brother to overcome the rocky resistance of the above class of paragraphs. Indeed, he shows a marvellous tact in eliciting from them a meaning diametrically opposite to that which they bear in the sense of the letter, and making them confirm the very tenet which they were intended to confute. "Can any thing be clearer than this

in showing that the external representative is *not* wholly done away?"

Yet we would by no means insinuate a disparaging idea of the course of Mr. D.'s reasoning on this score. It involves, in our opinion, many suggestions of undeniable truth, and of great weight, and such as evince a most profound acquaintance with the doctrines and philosophy of the New Church. But from his main conclusions we are obliged to dissent, because they strike us as directly at variance with the tenor of the above quotations. He contends, among other things, that the Jewish representatives were not so much *done away* as *fulfilled*, under the Christian dispensation—that consequently, "every representative form which is contained in the letter of the Word, and which may represent the internals of the Christian church, may be used in external Christian worship, provided the Christian, at the time of its use, knows, thinks of, and regards in it, its spiritual meaning"—that the serpent of the old ceremonies is to be made a staff of and lifted up in the holy acts of divine worship—that "among the representatives thus lifted up will undoubtedly be *priestly offices, priestly functionaries, and priestly garments*,"—that as in all true worship "there must be an external as well as an internal, therefore external representative rites are not to be wholly done away in the Christian church, so that its worship is to be internal alone; but every external rite may be adopted from the letter of the Word, and even from the Jewish ritual, so far as that is representative of, and correspondent to, divine things in the Word—provided they are congruent with the Christian, as an internal, church,"—that consequently, "the Christian may have Scriptural forms pictured and sculptured to his eyes—aromatic odors, with the forms of flowers that produce them in nature, or the incense of their burning extracts as products of art, for his nostrils—sweet sounds of harmonious choral music for his ears, and sacred and correspondent appliances to every sense"—that all these representatives are legitimated under the present dispensa-

tion "in order to give to the church the vastly increased *powers* of the ultimate principle of the mind, in developing, forming, perfecting, and securing all her internal principles"—that there is an important distinction between *true, pure, real*, or *genuine*, and *mere* or *external* representatives, and that "when the Lord abrogated the Jewish ritual, he merely abolished idolatrous representatives, thus removed the Judaic and Hebraic superadditions to genuine or internal representatives, or cracked the shell so as to give these true representatives as the kernel to the Christian church; and as priestly offices, and whatever had relation to those functions, were among the true representatives of the Ancient Church, therefore these were not abolished in the Christian church by the abrogation of the Jewish ritual."

These ideas are greatly and very ingeniously expanded in the work to which we refer, and being enunciated in a powerfully persuasive strain, and mingled with a goodly measure of genuine truth, one is led to distrust himself in calling them in question, while at the same time he feels assured that if the plain declarations of Swedenborg are to be received as true, there must be a lurking fallacy pervading the argument, and nullifying its force. This fallacy, if we mistake not, lies in Mr. D.'s views of the *external* of a church as compared with its *internal*. Thus, for instance, he cites Swedenborg as affirming that "priestly offices, and whatever had relation to their functions," are among the true, and therefore essential, externals of a church. This we are compelled to deny, and to justify this denial we quote the context at length in which the passage occurs.

"The first Ancient Church, which was spread far and wide over the face of the globe, particularly in Asia, in process of time, as is usual with all churches, in all places, grew degenerate, and was adulterated by innovations, both as to its external and its internal worship. This was the case in various countries, and this was owing especially to the circumstance, that all the significatives and representatives which the Ancient Church received by oral tradition from the Most Ancient Church, all which had respect to the Lord and his kingdom, were turned into idolatrous rites, and with some nations into magical cere-

monies. To prevent the destruction which hence threatened the whole church, it was permitted by the Lord that a significative and representative worship should be again restored in a particular country. This was effected by Heber ; and this worship consisted principally in external things. The external things employed were *high places, groves, statues, anointings, besides the establishment of priestly offices, and of whatever had relation to their functions ;* together with various other things which are included in the name of statutes or ordinances. The internals of their worship were doctrinals derived from the Antediluvians.—*A. C.* 1241.

Now, we cannot, for ourselves, perceive in this specification of externals that any one branch of them is of more intrinsic necessity than another ; that the priestly offices are any more *genuine* representatives than the high places, groves, statues, &c., with which they are classed. If one could be abolished, we see no reason why the other could not be, and if we understand our author, they *were* equally proscribed by the genius of the New Dispensation. But from this it does not follow that the law of correspondences is touched, or that the whole objective universe ceases to be a representative theatre for the display of internal and spiritual truths, and so far it is certain that representatives have not been abolished.\* Great stress, we know, is laid upon the statement of our author that both kings and priests, of whatsoever quality they are, represent the Lord by virtue of the royal and priestly principles appertaining to them, which of course we admit ; but we are at a loss to discover why this representative character does not belong as well to the kind of priests for which we contend, as to that which consti-

---

\* We are happy to find ourselves here in accordance with a writer in the "N. J. Magazine" (May, 1855) who in an able review of Rev. Mr. Benade's Resignation Sermon, thus remarks :—"The point in question is not whether ministers (priests) and other things are representative,—for no one who has read the doctrines of the Church can deny this,—but the question is, whether there is any thing in the doctrines that *requires* us to establish ministers (priests), altars, and other things of worship, besides Baptism and the Holy Supper, in their representative character, as indispensable parts of our worship. In the general sense, the Lord did not abolish representatives at his coming. Things represent now just as much as they ever did, though the representative is not seen. He only abrogated the *requirement to use* any representatives except Baptism and the Holy Supper."

tutes Mr. D.'s ideal. Cannot the spiritual represent the divine? A priest of the New Church is a man on the earth, and so far is a visible and external priest; but his priesthood is to be sought in his internal character and qualifications. Is he, for this reason, incapable of representing the Lord? So also as to his externals. It is a bruited apothegm that the church and the man of the church must have an external as well as an internal. Undoubtedly. But what then? Because a man is a spiritual man has he no external? Because the true priesthood of the church is composed of spiritual men possessed of certain endowments, and undistinguished from the so-called laity, has that priesthood no external? Does it not stand upon the ultimate plane? Is it not embosomed in the natural world? Have not such men bodies? Do they not meet for worship in earthly temples? Do they not engage corporeally in the services of prayer, praise, reading, discoursing, and the like, and are not these external things in respect to the internal principles by which they are prompted?

Did our limits permit, it would, we think, be easy to show that for the same reason that Mr. D. and those of his school find it impossible to form an idea of any other priest than one who is set apart and inducted into office by human agency, it is impossible for them also to conceive of any other representative external of such a priesthood than the paraphernalia of inaugurations, vestments, pulpits, litanies, &c., as to all which we see nothing in them, but the *shadows* of things which we are now permitted to enjoy richly in the *substance*. This view of the subject, we are well aware, will be regarded as crude and superficial, and it will be maintained that if we have not *just such* an idea of a priest of the New Church as that which is sketched out for us, we have *no idea of a priest at all*. If so, we submit. The imputation will not trouble us. We know that Swedenborg meant what he said when he said that the Lord at his coming into the world "abrogated the representatives, which were all external, and instituted a church of which all things should be internal."

We have not, in this connection, adverted to the argument founded upon the chapter entitled "Ecclesiastical and Civil Government," in the "Heavenly Doctrines," although well aware that that chapter is regarded perhaps by the mass of New Churchmen as a divinely appointed platform for the government, sacred and secular, of the New Jerusalem. We have waived a reference to this portion of Swedenborg's writings because we do not regard it in the light in which it is viewed by the advocates of the priesthood as a separate caste. They look upon it as laying down a distinct programme for the ecclesiastical polity of the New Church, just as they regard all the other chapters of the work as a divine code of doctrine and an authoritative rule of life to the members of the Church. This they infer from certain passages in which the author says, "This doctrine is from heaven, inasmuch as it is from the spiritual sense of the Word, and the spiritual sense of the Word is the same with the doctrine which is in heaven." Again, "I proceed to the doctrine itself, which is for the New Church, and which is called Heavenly Doctrine, because it was revealed to me out of heaven ; for to deliver this doctrine is the design of this work." That this work is, in its general scope, designed as an exponent of the peculiar doctrines of the New Church, we, of course, cannot doubt and still belong to that church ; but that this particular chapter is specifically intended as a *directory* to the New Church in the matter of its civil or ecclesiastical government we are by no means prepared to admit, and that for the following reasons :—

1. It is to our mind disproved by what our illumined author himself says in regard to the general character of the work :—"As to what concerns the following doctrine, this also is from heaven, *inasmuch as it is from the spiritual sense of the Word*, and the spiritual sense of the Word is the same with that which is in heaven." How is this chapter related to the spiritual sense of the Word ? To all the other chapters of the work are appended copious extracts from the Arcana confirming and

illustrating its various positions, but to this closing chapter there is not a single reference annexed. Moreover, the main subject matter of the chapter is Kings and Priests, of which the internal sense is Truth and Good. Why are not the latter the subject treated of, if the doctrine involved is the doctrine of the spiritual sense? How can the New Church, if it be a truly spiritual church, founded upon the spiritual sense of the Word, know any other than a spiritual priesthood and a spiritual kingship?

2. The opening sentence of the chapter strikes us as disclosing its genuine drift:—"There are two classes of affairs *amongst men* which ought to be conducted according to the laws of order." There is no specific mention made of the New Church, but the affairs spoken of are *affairs amongst men* widely and generally taken, implying, if we mistake not, that the author here passes from the consideration of the church to the wider field of the world at large.

3. The state of things described as making governors necessary is one entirely different from what we are taught to regard as predicable of the New Jerusalem. "It is impossible that order can be maintained in the world without governors, whose duty should be vigilantly to observe the proceedings of those who act according to order, and of those who act contrary to order, that they may reward the former, and punish the latter. Unless this were done, the human race would inevitably perish. The desire of ruling others, and of possessing their property, being hereditary in every individual, and being the source whence all enmity, envying, hatred, revenge, deceit, cruelty, and numerous other evils proceed; unless men, in the exercise of their prevailing inclinations, were, on the one hand, restrained by the fear of the laws, and the dread of punishment involving the loss of honor, of property, and of life, as a necessary consequence of a course of evil; and, on the other hand, encouraged by the hope of honor and of gain, as the reward of well doing, there would speedily be an end of the human

race." Now, we would ask if any candid and intelligent man, with Swedenborg's explication of the last two chapters of the Apocalypse in his hand, can possibly suppose this description to be applicable to the New Jerusalem. The New Jerusalem is a new church, in closest conjunction with heaven, and the men of that church are heavenly men, who are governed by other motives than the "fear of the laws, and the dread of punishment." Let the closing chapters of Isaiah be consulted, in which it is said of the New Jerusalem, that "henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean;" "thy people shall be all righteous;" and the declaration of John in the Apocalypse, that "there shall not enter into the city anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie," and then let any one pronounce whether such necessities for restraining laws and rulers can exist in that celestial economy.

4. The duty prescribed for priests is so worded in this chapter as unequivocally to imply that "divided" or denominational churches are contemplated by the language, which is wholly at variance with the idea of the *unitary* character of the church of the New Jerusalem. "With respect to priests, their duty is to teach men the way to heaven, and likewise to lead them therein. They are to teach them *according to the doctrine of their church* (*sux ecclesiæ*), which is derived from the Word of God; and to lead them to live according to that doctrine." We have here given the reading according to the original. The reader who consults almost any edition extant will find the rendering to be "*the church*," instead of "*their church*," but the error is palpable, though we are willing, in the lack of any knowledge to the contrary, to believe that it has crept into the translations without any express design of falsification. But it will be seen to change entirely the whole scope of the paragraph. What is the fair interpretation? Does it not imply that the priests or ministers of the *several* churches in Christendom, as, for instance, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, the Episcopal,



the Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Methodist, &c., are to teach according to the tenets which these bodies respectively hold as being, in their view, derived from the Word of God? Is it replied that this is virtually authorizing men to teach falsity instead of truth, and exhorting them to lead in a way which conducts to hell? We ask in reply whether it be not a law of conscience, or, in other words, a matter of Christian honesty and integrity, for every so-called priest to be faithful to his convictions, and to teach what he and the church to which he belongs sincerely believe to be the doctrines of truth derived from the Word? Is it not distinctly a principle of the New Church that every man is bound to be faithful to the light he has, though that light may not be the light of genuine truth? And is it wrong to define the duties of men as related to their present states, though those states should be very defective in many respects? If so, what shall be said of Swedenborg's Scortatory doctrine, in which he undeniably adapts his suggestions to the states of the natural man who is not yet prepared to act from higher promptings? The phraseology "their church," is not uncommon in our author's writings, and we may safely appeal to general usage as a key to his meaning in the passage before us. Thus, "those who are of the external church, are clearly in its externals, but obscurely in its internals, whereas those who are of the internal church are clearly in internals, and obscurely in externals; but those who are in externals, and not at the same time in internals, are not of the church; all those are in both who are in the good of life, *according to the doctrines of their church (ecclesiæ suæ)*; but those are in externals without internals, who are in worship, and not at the same time in the good of life according to the doctrines of the church."—*A. C.* 8762. "Those who are in the affection of truth from evil, that is, who desire to know truth merely for the sake of honor, gain, reputation, and the like, do not see truths, but only such things as confirm the doctrines of *their church (ecclesiæ suæ)*, whether they be true or false."—*A. C.* 8780.

What, then, is the genuine character and scope of the famous chapter on Ecclesiastical and Civil Government in the Heavenly Doctrines? We answer, that, as we understand it, it is not to lay down an authoritative draught or model of government, civil or sacred, in the New Church, but simply to *show the New Churchman in what light he is to view the existing politics of church and state in the world.* Such a man is to view everything from his own peculiar stand-point. It is a part of the grand economy of the Divine Providence to maintain order in the world, as far as is consistent with human freedom, and to this end he overrules the different existing institutions of church and state, while at the same time there may be elements involved in each which a truly divine system of order would effectually repudiate. Such a system is doubtless that of the New Jerusalem; but this is a system of slow development, and, in the mean time, while it is gradually maturing to its acmè, it is proper and salutary to the best interests of humanity that no violence should be done to men's convictions in regard to those things which they have been taught to consider sacred; and it is accordingly the object of our author in this chapter to unfold the principles by which men *ought* to be governed in upholding religion and civil government in the world, which are the grand pillars whereon the welfare of society rests. The chapter under consideration is, if we mistake not, a kind of general *conspectus* afforded to the man of the New Church of this department of the Divine Providence. He is instructed how to regard the whole complicated structure, and is shown by what means, or by the exercise of what principles, the benign results of these institutions are secured. If this be done preceptively, and the several duties of the spiritual and civil functionaries are clearly defined, it does not affect the general object of the enunciation, which, we repeat, is not in our estimation to lay down a platform of polity for the New Church, but to give a New Church view of politics already existing and long established in the world.

The fact that the priesthood exists in heaven, and that the worship there is conducted very much as on earth (*H. & H.* 215) is deemed by many as absolutely conclusive in favor of the popular view and the existing order of things. We have, of course, the most unbounded respect for the utterances and informations flowing from the enlightened herald of the New Church, and have only to be assured that in matters pertaining to the church his genuine and true-meant teachings go counter to our views to renounce them forthwith. But on this head we lack conviction. We are not by any means clear that the *apparent* measures the *real* contrariety existing between his statements and ours. Certain it is, that the *preaching* and the *priestly* function are not identified in heaven. "All the preachers are from the Lord's spiritual kingdom, and none from the celestial kingdom." "All preachers are constituted by the Lord, and thence in the gift of preaching; it is not lawful for any except them to teach in the temples. They are called *preachers* but not *priests*; the reason that they are not called priests is, because the priesthood of heaven is the celestial kingdom."—*H. & H.* 225, 226. The priesthood, therefore, pertains to all those who are in the good of love, which is the main character of the angels of the celestial kingdom. But these are not preachers. The preachers are from the spiritual kingdom, and they are "constituted" by the Lord, *i. e.*, as we understand it, they are the subjects of a special influx endowing them, *for the occasion*, with requisite qualifications, on the score of thought and affection, for the discharge of the function. It does not appear that the Lord "constitutes" them into a distinct order sustaining a fixed and permanent office. We infer rather that a strong divine afflatus comes upon certain spirits when convened for worship, under the influence of which they are enabled to speak to edification to the assembled groups, while on the ensuing Sabbath it may be that some other one or more may be moved to the exercise of similar gifts. In a word, we take it that as far as any earthly analogy may

be cited, the mode of worship among the Quakers comes the nearest to the heavenly model.

But even granting that the worship in heaven, as seen and described by Swedenborg, bore a very marked analogy to the prevailing modes of worship on earth, and suppose a similar distinction between clergy and laity, still we can account to the fact to our own minds without enforcing any change of views in regard to the fundamental question. The condition of things in the heaven which our author describes would naturally be governed in a greater or less degree, and for a longer or shorter time, by the internals of those who composed it, and when we consider that for ages the men of the church on earth had been accustomed to the conduct of religious affairs by the agency of a priesthood or a clergy, we can see what a violence would be done to the fixed forms of their spiritual life, had they been at once ushered into the midst of an economy entirely diverse from that which had been consecrated in their earthly memory. The heaven of recent souls in the other life will be, of course, in the first instance, a reflex of the church states in which they had mainly lived in the present life. But we know of nothing that requires us to believe that the type of heavenly things set forth by Swedenborg will be utterly and eternally unchangeable. The genius of the New Jerusalem, we imagine, will be of gradual development, both on earth and in heaven, and the only question is, whether the views above expressed do indeed rightly represent that genius. If so, we do not perceive that our conclusions are invalidated by anything affirmed of the state of the heavens when Swedenborg wrote. The ultimate effects of the Last Judgment, our author tells us (*T. C. R.* 123), had not been accomplished at that time, but were then going on, and *would continue to go on*. The reconstruction of the church in the way suggested in this essay may be one of them. At any rate, if our positions are sound, the order of things in the heavens will eventually conform to them.

We have thus exhibited, in strong relief, all the more

important passages usually cited as affording a warrant for the institution of a priesthood or clergy, comprising an order of men distinct from the so-called laity. To our own mind the proof, whether from the Word or the writings of the New Church, is utterly wanting of the intended existence of any such class of men in the Christian Church, and we do not therefore hesitate to consider the whole sacerdotal order, as at present established, both in the Old Church and the New, as a stupendous falsity, replete with tendencies of the most pernicious character to the interests of the Lord's kingdom. We are constrained by what we consider the strictest logical necessity, to deny the validity of the claims set up in behalf of a separate clerical caste, while, at the same time, we leave intact a leading or teaching function in the church, and one, too, that is to be exercised by the men of the church. There is a true ministry—not clergy—in the Lord's church on the earth, consisting of those who, in accordance with the representative character of the ancient Levites, are possessed of the endowments of spiritual love, enlightened intelligence, and active charity, which shall enable them to exercise a kindly pastoral office towards the lambs of the flock that naturally turn to their feeding hand. Every other form of priesthood we are forced to regard not only as an anti-christian usurpation, but as having the effect of an organic hypertrophy in the Lord's mystical body. By attracting to itself an over-measure of vital influx, it will rob the other portions of the system of their due share of spiritual innervation, and a paralysis of the members will be very certain to ensue. How much of enlightened discernment, indeed, is even now requisite in order to perceive that the broad line of distinction held to exist between clergy and laity, acts disastrously upon the interior life of the church by discharging the great mass of its members from that degree of responsibility which properly pertains to every one without exception? What is more evident than that the fact of having an individual salaried and set apart to preside over the spirit-

ual interests of a society, operates as a release to the bulk of the members from any duty but that of punctually paying their subscription and sitting devoutly in their seats from Sabbath to Sabbath, receiving with quiet assent whatever is dealt out to them. The practical working of the system is precisely such as to confirm the drift of our theoretical objections. It goes all along on the assumption that the actual *work* essential to the building up of the church is to be performed, not by the body collectively, but by a particular class acting as proxies for the rest. If we make the analogy of the human body the criterion in this matter, it would be as if all the organs and viscera of the trunk should unite in feeling the brain to perform their functions for them, while they should enjoy an exemption from their appropriate work. Is it possible for any one who is accessible to truth to avoid seeing that this cannot be consistent with a true Divine order? That order is well expressed by the Apostle of the Gentiles. "From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love." This is the true model of a Christian church or society, and the ends of such an institution can never be fully realized till there be a return from the present to the primitive order.

The precepts and intimations of the apostolic epistles may serve at least as documentary evidence of a historical kind, of the light in which this matter was viewed in the primitive church. "God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body; *but that the members should have the same care one for another.*"—1 Cor. xii. 24, 25. "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, *ye, which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.*"—Gal. vi. 1, 2. Whoever was spiritual might feel this a command to him to exercise a kindly office of charity in restoring one who

had unfortunately lapsed from his uprightness. Each was to bear the other's burdens. Again, "Now we exhort you, *brethren*, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men."—1 Thes. v. 14. *Brethren* are here exhorted to warn, comfort, and support each other—a very principal feature of what is considered as the pastor's peculiar work. "Wherefore comfort yourselves, *and edify one another*, even as also ye do."—*Id.* v. 11. Passages of this nature might be largely multiplied, but it is unnecessary. The gifts and services of the brethren are not to be superseded, in a proper church arrangement, by those of the clerical rank. The feeblest brother has as deep an interest in the general spiritual life of the society as the strongest. It is in fact the duty of every Christian man to edify, warn, support, and comfort his brethren, according to opportunities offered, and that upon the ground of a common concern in the spiritual well-being of the body.

It is doubtless much more consonant to the dictates of the natural man to purchase exemption from self-denying duties at the price of one's annual subscription to the support of a substitute, than to go forward and discharge them in person, especially when their discharge implies, in order to the best effect, that a prevailingly spiritual state of mind shall be sedulously cultivated. Accordingly nothing is more obvious than the air of easy unconcern with which the mass of Christians occupy their seats in the sanctuary on the Sabbath, and pass on through the week, devolving all care of the interests of the church on the spiritual stipendiary who takes them in trust. This is undoubtedly a necessary result of the system in vogue, and therefore we do not speak of it reproachfully in reference to any to whom our remarks may apply. They have been educated and have grown up under the system, and a thousand influences have been operating to prevent the suspicion of a wrong in it. They accordingly act as is most natural under the circumstances. While an external priesthood is recognized

in the church, it will not do to have the office remain a sinecure. The people pay the priests for assuming the care of their souls, and why should they do themselves the work which they bargain with another to do in their stead? The fact is, the evil can never be reached but by striking at the fundamental falsity on which the whole rests, to wit, a distinct priestly or clerical order. This is an institute which, in its present form, is to be traced back to the corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church, where the spirit of hierarchy is the animating soul of that vast corporation. That the great reformer, Luther, had a very clear perception of this is evident from the following passage in his "Letter on Ordination," addressed to the Bohemian brethren.

. . . "Let that rock stand to you unshaken—that, in the New Testament, of priest externally anointed there is none, neither can be: but if there be any, they are masks and idols, because they have neither example nor prescription of this their vanity, nor any word in Gospels or Epistles of the Apostles; but they have been erected and introduced by the mere invention of men, as Jeroboam did in Israel. For a priest, in the new Testament, is not made, but born; not ordained, but raised up; and he is born, not by the nativity of the flesh, but of spirit, that is, of water and the spirit in the laver of regeneration. And all Christians are altogether priests, and all priests are Christians; and let it be anathema to assert that there is any other priest than he who is a Christian; for it will be asserted without the word of God, on no authority but the sayings of men, or the antiquity of custom, or the multitude of those who think so. . . . Christ was neither shaven nor anointed with oil to be made a priest; wherefore neither is it enough for any follower of Christ to be anointed to become a priest, but he must have something far different; which when he shall have, he will have no need of oil and shaving. So that you may see that the bishops erred sacrilegiously whilst they make their ordinations so necessary that without these they deny that any one can become a priest, although he is most holy, as Christ himself; and again, that a priest may be made by them, although he be more wicked than Nero or Sardanapalus. By which what else do they than deny that Christ is a priest with his Christians? for whilst they discharge their abominable office, they make no one a priest unless he first deny that he is a priest, and so by that very circumstance, while they make a priest, they in truth remove him from the priesthood. . . . The ministry of the word is common to all Christians; that one passage, 1 Peter ii., establishes it: 'Ye are a royal priesthood that ye may show



forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.' I beseech you, who are they that are called out of darkness into his marvellous light? Are they only anointed and ordained priests? or are they not *all* Christians? But Peter not only gives them the liberty, but commands them to declare the praises of God, which certainly is nothing else than to preach the word of God. . . . As there is no other showing forth of the praises of God in the ministry of the Word than that common to all, so there is no other priesthood than a spiritual one, also common to all, which Peter hath here described. . . . Wherefore it hath now been sufficiently confirmed most strongly and clearly, that the ministry of the Word is the chief office in the church, altogether unique, and yet *common to all Christians*, not only by right but also of command; wherefore the priesthood also must needs be both excellent and common; so that against these divine lightnings of God's word of what avail are infinite fathers, innumerable councils, everlasting usages, and the multitude of the whole world?"

This is bravely said, though it has seldom found an echo in later days, nor are we by any means confident that the heroic Wirtemberger always speaks in his writings on this subject in the same strain. But that is immaterial. He saw then what we see now, that the priesthood of the Roman Church is the grand element of its power, and that its power in spiritual things is the breath of its nostrils. And though the institution exists in all Protestant Churches in a greatly modified and mitigated form, yet it is to this source that its origin is to be traced, and it is next to impossible to divest it altogether of its inherent tendencies towards the evils of hierarchy and the other forms of abuse to which we have adverted.

While frankly enouncing these sentiments we are perfectly aware of the light in which they will be viewed by the majority of the men of the church. They will look upon it as requiring nearly as much hardihood to deny a visible clergy in the church, as to deny the existence of the church itself. They will feel that a sad havoc is made of all their traditionary and cherished associations relative to the church, the ministry, the Sabbath, the worship of God, and indeed everything sacred; and they will be prompted to put the question, whether we really mean

*quite* so much as our words would seem to import. Assuredly we do ; and we will thank any man to designate the point at which we can *consistently* stop short of our present position provided our premises are sound. If there is no external priesthood known in the Lord's church, what authority is there for a clergy ? We find it not, and therefore state our conclusions without reserve. No hesitation have we in saying that in the truest and purest state of the church on earth, no other than a spiritual priesthood or clergy will be known, and what that is has been sufficiently unfolded in our previous remarks. It is a priesthood and a clergy which exists in an utter non-recognition of the distinction between them and the laity. These classes, as contra-distinguished from each other, are wholly unknown to a just ideal of the church.

That a multitude of questions should be started as to the sequences of such a theory as we have now announced we can readily anticipate. Who shall propagate the doctrines of the church ? Who shall conduct worship, and how shall it be done ?—will be among the first. What will be the use of churches in such a state of things ? Or, if we have them, what will be the use of a pulpit if there be no regularly inducted clergyman to fill it ?—will follow in the train. That in all these respects the adoption of our views would work momentous changes in the existing order of things there is no shadow of doubt. But of sudden changes we are no advocates. We have too correct a conception of the genius of N. C. teaching on this head to think of urging abrupt and violent innovations for which the states of men are not prepared. We know very well that at the present moment they are *not* prepared to forego a system to which they have long been habituated, and therefore we do not urge it. We would have changes introduced neither farther nor faster than the firm and intelligent convictions of N. C. receivers shall call for them. But we do not feel ourselves on this account precluded from broaching important principles. We hold that *it is never too early to give utterance to reformatory ideas.*

Though not at once *acted upon*, they are still *acting* as a secret leaven in the minds of men, and in due time will bring forth their proper fruits. This position, we are persuaded, cannot be logically controverted, and yet the man who ventures to act upon it must make up his mind to do it at his peril. He will not henceforth be regarded as a perfectly sane or safe man. In his reputation he must calculate to pay the penalty always visited upon the disturbers of old notions. "The last offence," says a French author, "forgiven to men is the introduction of a new idea." We write under the full force of this conviction. The broaching of such ideas, however, though somewhat startling at the outset, is less so upon reflection, and as they become familiarized to the thought, they assume new aspects, and gradually convert themselves to powerful elements of action. The Divine Providence has permitted and still tolerates a vicious order of things until his people, in the exercise of rationality and freedom, shall be prompted to institute a better. Meanwhile we have for ourselves no scruples as to compliance with established forms of worship and instruction, so long as we are conscious of inwardly upholding no abstract principle at variance with truth. Ministering truth and good to our fellow-men is ever a laudable use, and a man in doing it is not called upon always to proclaim his conviction that there are things usually connected with the function involving grave errors and requiring radical reform.

We should deem ourselves signally incompetent to the discussion of the present subject, were we not fully aware of the very great revolution which the ultimatum of our views is calculated to produce in the conduct of spiritual affairs. It is impossible for us to be blind to the fact, that the practical doing away of the distinction between clergy and laity, would put entirely a new face upon the services of the Sabbath, and present the whole matter of worship in a new light. And what if this were the result? What if the Sabbath gatherings of Christian

people should partake more of a social character? What if the principle of mutual instruction and edification should replace the present mode, in which a single individual conducts the entire routine? Is not such a method of instruction more accordant with the spirit of the New Church than that of professional preaching? This form of teaching was more in place at former periods, prior to the invention of printing, when books were few and expensive, and the mass of the people in Christian countries could neither read nor write. In such circumstances, when intelligence was limited, and the general habits of thought and speech not adapted to sustain such a mode of voluntary mutual instruction, it would be more natural that one man should be employed to officiate in behalf of a whole assembly. And so long as that was the case, the clerical caste undoubtedly performed an important use. But in the progress of things, that state of the general Christian mind has been outgrown, and a good degree of general competency to declare truth prevails. Why then should not those who are "of age" have the privilege of doing their own religious business? We grant that such a mode of procedure would be *liable* to abuses, just as is every system of polity where the freedom of the individual is thoroughly secured. But if good is the predominant element in the men of the church, true wisdom will not be wanting, and wisdom dwells evermore with prudence. The truth, moreover, that is derived from good, is always of a prolific or self-multiplying character, so that the word will dwell richly in all utterance even in the humbler and weaker of the brethren, as they are often accounted. The tongue of the stammerer shall speak plain, and as there will be few too ignorant to teach, so there will be none too wise to learn.

How is it now? The trained and professional preacher, being supported for this very work, has time to devote himself to the careful preparation of his discourses, and he will be led, of course, to elaborate them in finished style, and by degrees to conform them to the most admired models of composition, and thus to serve up weekly

to his audience an intellectual treat set off in all the graces of Tullian or Tertullian eloquence. The consequence is, that the mind of the hearer, being accustomed to this kind of pulpit entertainment, comes at length to nauseate the plain and homely style of extemporaneous talk among brethren. And yet who is not conscious that this kind of communication takes a deeper hold of the thoughts and affections and exercises more efficient control over the inner man, than the most studied oratorical displays to which one listens with mere passive acquiescence.

"The clear discourse, and cold as it is clear,  
Falls soporific on the listless ear."

But a change in this respect, in the conduct of public worship, will draw after it a change in the external arrangements which the present method has called into requisition. Pulpit and priesthood are inseparable ideas; and pulpit and pews are related to each other just as are clergy and laity. It is vain to think of abolishing the distinction in the one case and retaining it in the other. The architectural structure of churches is but an ultimatum of the falsities which we have thus far endeavored to expose. The proverbial sanctity of the pulpit must fall before the correction of the errors in which it has originated, as when the fancied "messenger of heaven and legate of the skies" has disappeared, his consecrated standing-place may as well vanish with him.

But in these circumstances, can the churches themselves, or the worship to which they are dedicated, be permanently retained? We doubt if they can, without undergoing the most signal alterations. The motive which prompts such alterations will be the enthronement of charity over faith alone, and charity can never breathe but in an atmosphere of use; and if use be the governing principle, it cannot but be a question whether the enormous sums expended upon church buildings, as also in the way of salaries to their official occupants, could not be expended to far greater advantage to the interests of

the Lord's kingdom in multiplying the issues of the press, and in this way propagating the saving truth of heaven. Plain and moderate buildings, adapted rather to small than to large audiences, and made proportionally numerous, will answer all the demands of those who recognize the church as composed of "living stones" instead of polished dead ones, and who would devote to beneficence what they can save from extravagance. And in regard to worship and the Sabbath, we can easily conceive of an equally great improvement founded upon what our enlightened author says on this head.

"By worship, according to the order of Heaven, is meant all the exercise of good according to the precepts of the Lord: by the worship of God at this day is meant, principally, the worship of the mouth in a temple, both morning and evening; but the worship of God does not consist essentially in this, but in a life of uses; this worship is according to the order of Heaven; the worship of the mouth is also worship, but it is altogether of no avail unless there be worship of the life."—*A. C.* 7884.

"Worship does not consist in prayers and in external devotion, but in a life of charity. . . . Spiritual affection is what is called charity towards our neighbor; to be in that affection is true worship; prayer is what thence proceeds. Hence it is plain that the essential principle of worship is a life of charity, and the instrumental thereof is gesture and prayer; or that the primary constituent of worship is a life of charity, and its secondary is praying; from which it is evident that they who place all Divine worship in oral piety, and not in actual piety, err exceedingly."—*A. E.* 395.

"Divine worship primarily consists in the life, of charity; and, secondarily, in that of piety; he, therefore, who separates the one from the other, that is, who lives in the practice of piety, and not at the same time in the exercise of charity, does not worship God."—*H. D.* 124.

Swedenborg no where disparages external worship, but again and again enjoins it, as *A. C.* 1175, 1618; but he evermore insists that the external apart from the internal in worship is of no avail; and under the guidance of this principle, we have no doubt that important changes may be advantageously made in the mode of

conducting it. A significant revelation respecting the true nature of worship meets us in the following extract from "*Heaven & Hell*" (222).

"Divine worship in the heavens does not consist in frequenting temples, and in hearing preaching, but in a life of love, charity and faith, according to doctrines; preachings in temples serve only as means of instruction in matters of life. I have spoken with angels on this subject, and I said, that in the world it is believed that Divine worship is only to frequent temples, hear preaching, attend the sacrament of the supper three or four times every year, and do the other things of worship according to the statutes of the church, and likewise set apart particular times for prayer, and then to behave devoutly. The angels said, that these are external things which ought to be done, but that they are of no avail unless there be an internal from which they proceed, and that the internal is a life according to the precepts which doctrine teaches."

Whatever, then, goes to make the worship on earth most akin to the worship in heaven, ought to be the object aimed at by the Lord's people, in conducting their Sabbath services. For ourselves, we are firmly of the opinion, that the plan of mutual instruction, on a perfectly voluntary basis, is far better adapted to accomplish this end than the present system, in which a single individual is *instar omnium*, or a kind of spiritual *fac-totum* to the congregation. How vastly more desirable that each member of a Christian society, according to his measure of gifts, should contribute his quota to the general stock of instruction and excitation in the spiritual life. Men learn more by the exercise of thought, and the putting forth of affection in the effort to edify others, than by listening to sermons when their faculties of use to others are in abeyance. It is, moreover, a positive disadvantage that men should have a hired functionary to do their thinking for them. Religious meetings, as usually conducted, are on a plan less manly than district schools, for the congregations do not even recite their lessons, but have them recited by the master. Their problems are all worked out for them, and they sit and hear the solutions with little interest and little profit. The people actually need, for their own spiritual health, a great part

of the intellectual exercise from which their ministers now relieve them. Adult Bible and doctrinal classes are now to a great extent conducted on this plan, and nothing is more evident than their tendency to develope among the mass of members all the capacities necessary to sustain the system. So would it be in the services of the Sabbath; and we think it unquestionable that each society of the New Church has a claim upon the powers and resources of all its members. The plea of incompetency will no doubt be urged in regard to multitudes in the church, but with the same propriety it might be urged that certain portions of the human body are incompetent to contribute any thing towards the perfection of the whole. If there be any such part of the bodily structure, it does not belong there. But the fact is, the difficulty in the case supposed arises from the operation of a false standard in regard to what is most useful in the way of social impartation. It is not the most finished and elaborate discourses which do the most good. They excite admiration, but they seldom move the inner springs of action. They play round the head, but they reach not the heart. The plain and even homely utterances of a good man, accompanied by the sphere which his goodness engenders, will commend themselves by a certain unction to every kindred mind, and the absence of literary or rhetorical qualities will not be felt. The teachings of the New Church on this subject, disclosing the nature and the relations of goodness and truth, and assuring us that all truth is seminally included in good, ought to have the effect to exclude fastidiousness on this score, and to lay the mind open to the reception both of truth and good even from the humblest sources.

Another fair and very important inference from our premises here urges itself upon us. How many infant and feeble societies in the New Church, are kept back and drag along a dying kind of life, from an impression of the almost indispensable necessity of a minister both to their well-being and their being. There is no occasion, indeed, to be surprised at this, for a clergy will be



sure to teach, among its first and last lessons, the absolute necessity of its own order to the welfare of the church, and in this way to lay the spell of inertia upon the mass of the laity. How, then, can they find their hands when they have been so carefully hid away by their spiritual masters? The effect answers perfectly to the cause, and precludes the language of censure towards the private receivers scattered over the country, for they have merely practiced upon the copy that has been set them. Nor in fact can we properly adopt a tone of severe reproof towards the copy-masters themselves. They, too, have acted according to the light that was in them. They have not *intended* either error or evil; we therefore view the past with all allowance. But it is easy to perceive what the result has been, and continues to be. Dependence upon a superior divinely commissioned order of teachers and leaders, and the fear of trenching upon the sanctity of their prerogatives, has tended to paralyze exertion on the part of receivers, and to inure and reconcile them to a low state, and a slow progress, in spiritual things. How is this condition to be remedied? Not by a supposed adequate supply of ministerial laborers in the field, who shall receive a competent support from the flocks which they feed. For years and years to come this is utterly out of the question in the New Church. There are scores of expectant clergymen among us at this moment who are ready to enter the vineyard, but who can find none who will pay them their wages. Except in a very few prominent localities in our country, a competent ministerial support is absolutely hopeless. This, for ourselves, we look upon as a pregnant commentary of the Divine Providence upon the truth of our main positions. It indicates to us that it is not by a clergy that the New Church is either to be sustained or propagated. It must be by every man of the church realizing himself to be a church in the least form, and bound to act as if he were himself charged with the responsibility of the priesthood involved in his church character. All in a society or a neighborhood,

who have the heavenly doctrines at heart, ought to feel it incumbent upon them, both jointly and severally, to see that their "coal be not quenched," that their lamp go not out. They are each and all to supply the minister's lack of service, and every one who enters such a society should do it with a distinct understanding that such are the conditions of membership—that a New Church society is a spiritual firm in which there are no silent partners, but every one is to be an active working member, always carrying with him the conviction that the concern is complete in itself, that it must depend entirely upon its own efforts, and that its solvency and success can only be secured by every one, without exception, feeling as if the result depended wholly upon him.

So in the matter before us; we see no other method by which the little bands of receivers scattered over the country can ever be prompted to arouse themselves from that torpid, dead-and-alive condition into which they are so prone to fall, than by being weaned from reliance on the ministry, and thrown upon their own resources; and how can this be done without discarding *in toto* the very fundamental idea of a clergy or a priesthood *as a distinct order of men*? A priestly principle there must ever be in the church, but that this principle must ultimate itself in a separate priestly caste under the New Jerusalem dispensation is, we are persuaded, one of the first-born of falsities which unfortunately has made itself "higher than the kings of the earth," i. e., to dominate over some of the chiefest truths of the church.

That the fruits of this system have not been all evil we of course admit, and we have expressly said that we have no "railing accusations" to bring against the parties who have, without consciously intending it, fastened a false and pernicious system of clerical order on the church. But we feel, at the same time, no restraint from pointing to the "mischiefs manifold" which refer themselves to this source. Among these we have barely adverted to one which demands a more definite presentation. We allude to the every where prevalent idea that the Lord's

New Church is to be propagated mainly by the agency of preaching. This certainly cannot be if our previous position is sound, that the very office of the preacher, as ordinarily apprehended, is a fallacy. Let this position be tried upon its merits. "But how is the gospel of the kingdom to be proclaimed?" it will be asked. We reply, by means of the press and the living voice, not of the minister or the missionary *as such*, but of the ordinary member *as such*. In the mode now specified, every society or circle of receivers is to regard itself as virtually a band of propagandists, whose main business it is, in this world, to live and labor for this end. To this every thing else is to be subordinate, without at the same time being neglected. Worldly resources are needed for spiritual uses, and when every thing is viewed in relation to eternal ends, we are doing our utmost to superinduce a church-state upon the world at large—the grand finale to which the Divine Providence is shaping its counsels. Nothing, indeed, is more abhorrent to the true genius of the New Church than a spirit of indiscriminate proselytism; but there is doubtless a growing receptivity in the world which prefers a claim to be provided for, and this claim will hardly fail to be met if the principles of church polity now advocated be thoroughly carried out. The fact is, the true church of the Lord is in its own nature self-propagating. It diffuses itself by outgrowth or offshoots, like trees and vines. There is a spontaneous multiplication of societies wherever a true spiritual vitality exists to give the start. There is in the essential life of a true New Church society a constant *conatus* to reproduce itself in similar forms, and if the converse of the apostle's aphorism, that "evil communications corrupt good manners," hold good, to wit, that "good communications purify bad manners," then we may reasonably hope that the quiet intercourse of the men of the church with others, their blameless example, their solid, if not imposing intelligence, will be constantly operating, like a wholesome leaven in the general mass of mind till the whole is leavened. The upright walk, the sphere of

charity, the unwearied study of use—all which will be sure to make themselves known and felt—will no doubt effect as much in concentrating attention upon the truths of the church as the discourses and appeals of a commissioned clergy, who will always have to contend, more or less, with the prejudice founded upon the fact that the preaching of the gospel is with them a paid calling instead of a voluntary service.

But this noiseless and unobtrusive insemination of good and truth, within the range of each one's personal influence, is not the sole ground of reliance in the propagation of the doctrines and life of the New Church. The press is the great executive ministry of the present age. It is by its instrumentality that the furtherance of the Lord's kingdom on the earth is mainly to be effected. Here, then, is the channel through which New Church efforts are to be made to tell upon the progress of truth and righteousness. The press we deem a vastly more efficient agency of the church than an ordained clergy; and could the large sums annually expended in paying salaries and building churches, be laid out in publishing and circulating the writings of the church, we are satisfied that a far more substantive use would be accomplished for the cause of the New Jerusalem. And let us here say, that while the employment of lay missionaries and colporteurs in great numbers and on a large scale may not be without its good results, yet, after all, this system of operation is apt to serve as a virtual discharge of the mass of members from the duty of direct personal effort in this sphere. The proper state of things will not be reached till every one who prizes the spiritual treasures of the New Church shall feel himself constrained to become a missionary to his neighbor, without waiting to have the work done to his hands by a proxy. Why should not every Newchurchman feel himself bound, according to his ability, to keep on hand a supply of the writings with which to furnish, by sale or gift, those whom he may regard as proper objects of such a favor? The apathy which has heretofore so widely pre-

ailed on this score, is no doubt referable to the same general cause to which we have traced so many of the evils that have afflicted the church. The obligations of duty have been commuted on the principle of clerical substitution, and instead of being sacredly discharged have been secularly disbursed. We look, eventually, for an entirely different procedure in this respect. We can form no idea of a truly prosperous state of the church, but one in which the individual shall more and more assert himself—in which individual effort and action shall not be so perpetually merged in association. Still we would by no means forego this kind of ministration to the uses of the New Church. In the matter of printing and publishing they are of immense importance. But our ideal of a zealous Newchurchman, is of one who is so intent upon ministering to the spiritual weal of his fellow-creatures, that just in proportion to his worldly means, he will not only purchase and distribute the works of the church, but, if needs be, will actually, in particular cases, publish and distribute them at his own cost, where he is persuaded a great use will be thereby accomplished. At any rate, most cordially will he come forward to sustain the labors of those who, as a class, would fain dedicate their powers, by means of the pen, to the building up of the walls and temples of the New Jerusalem.

But we are admonished that we cannot indefinitely extend our thoughts even upon the momentous theme before us. We have uttered ourselves upon it with all frankness and freedom, and in full view of the consequences. We have been all along aware of the "revolt of mien," of the estrangement of confidence, of the alienated sympathy, which the declaration of such sentiments will not fail to encounter in the minds of many of our brethren. That they will strike their minds as the very extreme of destructive radicalism, is more than probable. Nevertheless, we have spoken advisedly; and however we may deprecate the sinister judgment and the sombre auguries of those whose good opinion we

covet, we are prepared to encounter them, if fidelity to truth makes it inevitable. We have only to request, that whatever exceptions may be taken to the views propounded, they may be taken to the abstract argument itself, and not to the practical inferences which we may be supposed to draw from it. We can readily perceive how natural would be the conclusion, that if an external priesthood in the New Church be a falsity, it ought of course to be regarded as a nonentity, and that therefore the whole system should be abandoned instantly, as a crying abomination before heaven. We have already spoken in pre-arrest of any such sentence as this. We are no advocates of sudden changes in the fixed habits and usages of the Christian world. We would precipitate nothing before the fitting time. The present order of things involves, indeed, a multitude of evils, but it has gradually supervened upon the order of heaven, and gradually must it be removed. Meanwhile we have for ourselves not the slightest hesitation, in view of the present exigency, to act in a capacity which is ordinarily termed clerical, for the Divine Providence has the lowest as well as the highest states of the church under its auspices; and for the same reason, we have no denunciations to utter against the general body of those who now sustain the sacred office, and of whom it cannot justly be doubted that they have entered it with the most upright intentions, and who continue to administer it according to the best light they have respecting its nature and ends.

But all this does not vacate the force of our reasoning. In respect to our main position—the utter repugnance of a priestly or clerical caste to the genius of the New Dispensation—we are firm and immovable; and fain would we have every member of the Lord's Church appreciate fully his birthright, and act under the consciousness of the high things involved in his prerogative. Regarding it no more as an exclusive prerogative, confined to a certain privileged order, and fixing the thought, not upon the shadow but upon the substance, let every New Church Christian realize, that whatever is embraced

within the functions of the priestly and the royal office, pertains truly to him in and under the Lord; and let him therefore walk feeling charged with the responsibility of this sacred character. Every one without exception is a king and a priest, so far as he is in the truth and good of the Lord's Kingdom, and that, too, "unimpeached of usurpation, and to no man's wrong." It is not alone in consecrated ranks that we are to look for the priests of the Lord's heritage. Wherever you find one that is meek, gentle, guileless, loving, truthful, and wise—who is in the life of love—whose sphere is bland and attractive, because his spirit is deeply leavened with charity—whose speech is marked by a certain unction indicative of an inward fountain of delight—there is to you one whom you may safely acknowledge as a "priest of the Most High God." It matters not that ordaining hands may not have been laid upon his head. It matters not that he may be unable to bring due credentials of the fact of his falling into the line of the apostolic succession. To you he is a priest, because it is in these very qualities that the priestly principle consists, and if you possess these qualities, you thereby become in like manner a priest to others. The unction of love is the only oil of consecration by which the true priests of the church are now to be inaugurated.

A similar vein of remark is applicable also to the kingship, the spiritual dignity founded upon Truth. The man most largely endowed with this principle, when derived from good, is clothed, from the necessity of the case, with a sort of royalty, which will be very certain to be felt and acknowledged by those who come in contact with his sphere. In this republican land, the name of king, as a civil ruler, is very offensive, and that too upon very good grounds. But the true interior quality denoted by the title, to wit, truth ruling, and involving the idea of ascendancy, predominance, weight, influence, moral control, characterize the man to whom the term is applicable. His judgment rules in counsels, and submission to it is easy and natural. "In heaven one prefers

another to himself as he excels in intelligence and wisdom : the love itself of good and truth, produces this effect, that every one subordinates himself, as it were, of himself, to those who are in the wisdom of good and the intelligence of truth superior to himself.”—*A. C.* 7773. There is nothing forced or galling, to a right mind, in the deference paid to truth, when assured that it *is* truth—truth flowing from a Divine source—for it seems identical with the light of our own intelligence which we cannot choose but obey ; whereas, let any one endeavor to bear down heavily upon us by the simple dead weight of official standing, of power and authority, and we are soon goaded into indignant resistance. Such government is not royalty but despotism, and against this the free spirit of the Lord’s people arrays and braces itself with instinctive promptitude. But the sceptre of genuine truth is a golden sceptre, *i. e.* having the element of good as its basis ; and such a sceptre is wielded by every one of the spiritual kings in the Lord’s Church. To this species of royalty let every son of the kingdom aspire, and in him will be fulfilled the self-affirmed but divinely authorized predication of the inspired Word, which is but an echo to the language of our text, “Thou hast made us unto our God *Kings* and *Priests*, and we shall reign upon the earth.”



## PREACHING.

IN REPLY TO REV. GEORGE FIELD.

IN the second volume of the Repository (Feb. 1849) we had occasion to notice the Report of a Committee on Lectures and Licenses made at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Michigan and Northern Indiana Association of the New Church, held Feb. 3, 1849, in which it was resolved, as the sense of the committee, that "Every member of this Association, in accordance with what is taught in *Doct. Char.* No. 101, consider the communication of free and sincere instruction on religious matters, according to his ability and disposition, to be at once his duty and his privilege." From this resolution the Rev. George Field, as a minority of one, dissented, and offered a report, subsequently published, which was entitled "A Protest of the Minority of the Committee on Lectures and Licenses against that part of the (majority) Report which acknowledges the right of Lay Inauguration into the priestly office; and of Preaching without Ordination or License." This Protest of Mr. Field we published in the March number of the Repository, (1849,) and in reference to the following paragraph, felt constrained to advert to what we deemed a philological error in his reasoning upon Acts, viii. 4, "They that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the Word," from which the inference is drawn in the majority report that these were laymen. Upon this Mr. F. remarks:

"Both in the Greek and Latin, there are two different words used for that which is rendered in English by this one word, *preaching*. In the Latin, one word is *predico*, which is literally what we mean by *preaching*, and is used to denote the addressing of a large number of persons, either in the Synagogue, the Temple, or the open air. The other word is *evangelus*, or an evangelist, i. e. *the bearer of good news*, such as went *from house to house*, bearing intelligence of the joyful

tidings ; those who evangelized therefore were not performing the proper functions of a priest, or publicly preaching, but such as by private instruction and exhortation went from place to place. This, though sometimes performed by the Apostles themselves, was nevertheless, more particularly the province of the *evangelizers*, who are called 'Assistant preachers of the Apostles.' (See Gr. Lex.) Now the word used in the passage above quoted (Acts viii. 4) for preaching is *evangelizantes*, or the *carrying with them wherever they were scattered abroad the Gospel news*. But in the very next verse, where mention is made of Philip (an Apostle) going down to them and *preaching* to the citizens of Samaria, who were assembled to hear him, the word used is *predicabit*. Thus, this text actually refutes the very position it was advanced to prove."—*Report*, p. 44, 45.

To this we replied in the following remarks :

Now the fact is, the original word here is *ἐκηρύσσει*, *ekerusse*, which is not fairly represented by the English word *preach*. Campbell, in his Dissertation on this and kindred terms (*Prelim. Dissert.* vol. i., p. 230), after remarking that *kerusso* comes from *keruō*, a crier, also a herald, and signifies to *cry, publish, or proclaim*, and *kerugma*, the thing published or proclaimed, goes on to say:—"To *preach* is defined by Johnson, in his dictionary, 'to pronounce a public discourse upon sacred subjects.' This expresses with sufficient exactness the idea we commonly affix to the term. For we may admit that the attendant circumstances of church, pulpit, text, worship, are but appendages. But the definition given by the English lexicographer cannot be called an interpretation of the term *kerusso*, as used in scripture. For so far is it from being necessary that the *kerugma* should be a discourse, that it may be only a single sentence, and a very short sentence too. Nay, to such brief notifications we shall find the term most frequently applied. Besides, the word *kerusso* and *kerugma* were adopted with equal propriety, whether the subject were sacred or civil. Again, though the verb *kerusso* always applied public notice of some event either accomplished or about to be accomplished, often accompanied with a warning to do or forbear something ; it never denoted either a comment on, or explanation of, any doctrine, critical ob-

servations on, or illustrations of, any subject, or a chain of reasoning in proof of a particular sentiment. And if so, to pronounce publicly such a discourse as, with us, is denominated sermon, homily, lecture or preaching, would by no means come within the meaning of the word in its first and most common acceptation. It is not therefore so nearly synonymous with *didasko*, to teach, as is now commonly imagined."

To these remarks Mr. F. sent us a rejoinder, which was published in the Repository for May (1849). This we now give in full with our comments upon the positions involved:

DEAR SIR,

Will you be kind enough to show me in what way my remarks on Acts viii. 4, "betray a philological error," as I confess myself at a loss to see it, from your present criticism. I have stated that there are generally two words, both in the Greek and Latin Testaments, which are given in the English version by the one word "preaching;" and that the Latin word answering to the Greek *ekerusse* is *prædico*, which is literally what we mean by *preaching*, and is used to denote the addressing of a large number of persons, either in the Synagogue, the Temple, or the open air.

Whatever force there may be in your objection, seems to be conveyed in the assertion that the original Greek word *ekerusse*, "is not fairly represented by the English word *preach*." On this, I would remark, that I believe in every case where the word "*ekerusse*" is used in the Greek Testament, its synonym in the Latin is *prædico*, *prædicans*, &c. I presume, therefore, that it will be admitted that *ekerusse* is fairly represented in the Latin tongue by *prædico* as its equivalent.

And not only from such authorities as I have at hand does it appear that the English word "*preach*," is synonymous with the Latin *prædico* and the Greek *ekerusse*, but that the meaning given in each language is the same; as confirmed by the constant use of this word in the New Testament in the same sense as given by myself, and as defined by lexicographers, and admitted by you.

In the London Encyclopædia this word is thus defined, "PREACH—French, *prescher*; Latin, *prædico*; to deliver a public discourse upon sacred subjects; to proclaim; publish; inculcate:—a preacher is one who discourses publicly on religion. . . . 'There is not anything publicly notified, but we may properly say it is *preached*.'—Hooker." Worcester defines it thus, "PREACH—[*prædico*, Latin—*prêcher*, Fr.] to discourse publicly on the Gospel, &c.; to pronounce a public discourse upon a sacred subject:" also, "to proclaim or publish in religious orations or sermons; to inculcate publicly; to teach." And

Webster, in strict agreement with the above, says, it is to "pronounce a public discourse on a religious subject, or from a text of Scripture. To discourse on the Gospel way of salvation, and exhort to repentance. To proclaim; to publish in religious discourses," &c.

If you will compare these definitions with the one given by myself as the meaning of *ekerusse* and *prædico*, I think you must admit that they agree precisely; nothing is said of the *length* of time used in preaching; whether it be an hour, half an hour, or fifteen minutes; but that the preachers were the public heralds of the Lord's advent; speaking by authority as a herald should. And so far as I can find, in every place where the Lord was thus publicly proclaimed, it was by a commissioned preacher, and in every instance where it is recorded, the Greek word used is *ekerusse*, which is answered in the Latin by *prædico*. Thus when John *preached* in the wilderness (Mark i. 4), "There went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem," &c.: and he *preached* the remission of sins, and said, "there cometh one mightier than I, after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose." "And he said unto them, Let us go into the next towns that I may *preach* there also. And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee," Mark i. 38, 39. And Jesus "*preached* in the synagogues of Galilee," Luke iv. 44. And Saul *preached* Christ in the synagogues, Acts ix. 20. Peter also says, that the Lord commanded him "to *preach* unto the people," Acts x. 42.

In all these places the Greek word is the same (*ekerusse*), and the meaning coincides precisely with that given above of *preaching*. How long time they preached, is not known. It is not probable that in any case all the words they uttered are recorded, or but little more than the subject of their discourse. Thus upon one occasion in the synagogue when the Lord took a text from the prophet Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," &c., and "the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And He began to say unto them, This day is the Scripture fulfilled in your ears. And all bare Him witness and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth," Luke iv.—those divine words which produced this astonished feeling do not appear to be recorded at all.

I cannot but think also that your author (Campbell) must be wrong in saying that this word (*ekerusse*) was "adopted with equal propriety, whether the subject were sacred or civil." Is it ever used in the New Testament to proclaim merely *civil* news? It seems to me to contain too much of the name of the Lord (*kurios*) in it, to admit of its being properly used for any other purpose than to announce His advent; i. e. a coming in the name of the Lord;—proclaiming by authority and dogmatic teaching His coming to redeem and save—crying that name in the wilderness, and publishing it abroad in all the earth. Thus *preaching* is truly a *public* annunciation of the Lord, and the conditions of salvation, to collect audiences whether at His first or second advent; whilst *evangelizing* was properly the more private act of telling it to individuals or families, in a conversational, or social capacity; as when

it is written that Philip *preached* to the Eunuch, the word used is not *ekerusse*, but *evangelisato*.

As I wish to be right in every point, on this subject as well as others, I have endeavored to be so ; but if you in any particular show me truly where I err, I shall be thankful for the information, and will endeavor to profit by it. But permit me to say a word more in conclusion ; I think you have hardly been just in making it appear that the weight of my objection to the inference drawn from the narrative in Acts viii. 4, depended upon what you have termed a “ philological error,” as it appears to me to be refuted without the verbal criticism which I offered.

With sincere regard for your zeal in the cause of the New Jerusalem,  
I remain very truly, yours,  
GEORGE FIELD.

Detroit, Mich., 1849.

The ground upon which we employed the phrase “ philological error,” in reference to Mr. Field’s report, was what we deemed the want of a due discrimination in regard to the Scripture usage of the terms generally rendered in our version *to preach*, and the building an important conclusion upon a translation instead of appealing directly and mainly to the original. He says, for example, in the passage quoted, that, “ both in the Greek and Latin there are two different words used for that which is rendered in English by this one word, *preaching*. In the Latin, our word is *prædico*, which is literally what we mean by *preaching*, and is used to denote the addressing of a large number of persons either in the Synagogue, the Temple, or the open air.” Now it is plain that this is interpreting the Greek from the Latin—whereas, the reverse is the true process—and leading the English reader to suppose that *prædico* in Latin, and *preach* in English are perfect equivalents to *kerusso* in Greek. This we attempted to show, in regard to the latter, is not the case, and with this view we quoted, at some length, from Campbell, a passage going to prove that the leading idea conveyed by the Greek *kerusso*, from *kerux*, a *crier* or herald, is not fairly represented by the leading idea involved in the English word *preach*, which is defined by Johnson and by Mr. Field’s authorities, “ to pronounce a public discourse upon sacred sub-

jects." The scope of our brother's argument is to evince that the function indicated by the term translated *preach* was not properly to be performed by laymen, although the office denoted by *evangelizo* (from *evangelos*, *evangelist*) might be discharged by them. "Those who evangelized were not performing the proper functions of a priest or publicly preaching, but such as by private instruction and exhortation, went from place to place." Now, to say nothing of the implication in these words, that public preaching was a part of the priest's office, whereas his duty was solely to offer sacrifices and minister at the altar, the function of *preaching*, according to the genuine purport of the original word, was as open to what are considered the laity as that denoted by the term for *evangelizing*. As it implies, in its dominant import, simply *announcing*, *proclaiming*, *publishing*, or *acting the part of a herald or crier*, every one who had himself received the message of the Gospel, was at liberty to *announce* or *promulgate* it to others.

As Campbell in his preliminary dissertations has gone most elaborately into the usage of the New Testament writers in respect to this whole class of words having relation to what is usually understood by *preaching*, I shall again draw upon his pages in this connection.

"Further, I must take notice, that though announcing publicly the reign of the Messiah comes always under the denomination, *kerussein*, no moral instructions, or doctrinal explanations, given either by our Lord, or by his apostles are ever either in the Gospels or in the Acts, so denominated. Thus, that most instructive discourse of our Lord, the longest that is recorded in the Gospel, commonly named his sermon on the mount, is called *teaching* by the evangelist, both in introducing it, and after the conclusion (Matt. v. 2, vii. 28, 29). 'Opening his mouth, *he taught them*, saying:' and, 'when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished, *at his doctrine*,' his manner of teaching. It is added, 'for he *taught* them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes.' He is said to have been employed in teaching

(Matt. xiii. 54, Mark vi. 2, Luke vi. 15, 22) when the wisdom, which shone forth in his discourses, excited the astonishment of all who heard him. In like manner, the instructions he gave by parables, are called teaching the people, not preaching to them (Mark iv. 1, 2) and those given in private to his apostles, are in the same way styled (Mark viii. 31) teaching, never preaching. And if teaching and preaching be found sometimes coupled together, the reason appears to be, because their teaching, in the beginning of this new dispensation, must have been frequently introduced by announcing the Messiah, which alone was preaching. The explanations, admonitions, arguments and motives, that followed, came under the denomination of teaching. Nor does anything else spoken by our Lord and his disciples, in his lifetime, appear to have been called preaching, but this single sentence, ‘Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ In the Acts of the Apostles, the difference of meaning in the two words is carefully observed. The former is always a general and open declaration of the Messiah’s reign, called emphatically the good news, or Gospel; or, which amounts to the same, the announcing of the great foundation of our hope, the Messiah’s resurrection; the latter comprehends every kind of instruction, public or private, that is necessary for illustrating the nature and laws of this kingdom, for confuting gainsayers, persuading the hearers, for confirming and comforting believers. The proper subject for each is fitly expressed in the conclusion of this book (Acts xxxviii. 31), where, speaking of Paul, then confined at Rome in a hired house, the author tells us that he received all who came to him, ‘*preaching* the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.’ Announcing to them the reign of God, and instructing them in everything that related to the Lord Jesus Christ.”

In a subsequent paragraph he thus comments on the Latin translation of the original:—

“In regard to the manner wherein this word has been translated, with which I shall finish what relates

peculiarly to it, we may observe that *prædicare*, used in the Vulgate, and in all the Latin versions, corresponds entirely to the Greek word in its primitive meaning, and signifies to give public notice by proclamation. In this sense it had been used by the Latin classics, long before the Latin translation of the Bible into their tongue. But *prædicare*, having been employed uniformly in rendering *kerussein*, not only in the history, but in the Epistles, has derived from the latter use a signification different and much more limited than it has in profane authors. Now, this additional or acquired signification is that which has principally obtained amongst ecclesiastics; and hence has arisen the sole meaning in modern languages ascribed to the Word, whereby they commonly render the Greek *kerusso*. The Latin word is manifestly that from which the Italian *predicare*, the French *preacher*, and the English to *preach*, are derived. Yet these three words correspond to the Latin only in the last mentioned and ecclesiastical sense, not in the primitive and classical, which is also the Scriptural sense in the Gospel and Acts. Thus the learned Academicians della Crusca, in their Vocabulary, interpret the Italian *predicare*, not by the Latin *prædicare*, its etymon, but by *concionari, concionem habere*; terms certainly much nearer than the other to the import of the word used in the other two languages mentioned, though by no means adapted to express the sense of *kerussein* in the historical books. This is another evidence of what was observed in a former dissertation, that a mistake, occasioned by supposing the word in the original, exactly correspondent to the term in the common version, by which it is usually rendered, is often confirmed, instead of being corrected by recurring to translations into other modern tongues, inasmuch as from the same, or similar causes, the like deviation from the original import has been produced in these languages as in our own."

From all this we may perhaps deem ourselves warranted in applying the phrase "philological error" to the remarks of Mr. Field on the import of the original word



for *preaching*. In regard to the peculiar meaning of *evangelizo*, *evangelos*, as denoting the impartation of good news, our friend is no doubt correct, but when he would make it a distinction between this term and *kerrusso*, that the one denoted a function which none but the clergy could properly perform, while the other fell within the sphere of laical uses, we are obliged to dissent from his position altogether. And it is worthy of notice that while in Acts viii. 4, 5, we read that when "they were scattered abroad and went every where preaching (*evangelizantes*) the word, then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and *preached* (*ekerusse*) Christ unto them;" yet in v. 12, of the same chapter we find the phraseology varied; but when they believed Philip *preaching* (*evangelizomeno*) the things concerning the Kingdom of God," &c. Indeed as a Newchurchman we presume Mr. Field will appreciate the following note of Mr. Clowes on Luke viii. 1, "And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, *preaching* (*kerrusson*) and *declaring the glad tidings* (*evangelizomenos*) of the kingdom of God." "A distinction," says Mr. Clowes, "is here made between *preaching* (Gr. *kerrusso*) and *declaring the glad tidings of* (*evangelizomenos*); *preaching* having more respect to the affection of divine and heavenly good in the *will*, whilst *declaring the glad tidings of*, has more respect to the illumination of the divine and heavenly truth in the *understanding*. Thus both expressions combined have reference to and mark the divine and heavenly marriage of good and truth, with which the whole world is replenished." If this be well founded, then it would seem that *preaching* rather than *evangelizing* denotes that "insinuation of good" which Swedenborg allows to every member of the Church, while he apparently restricts the "insinuation of truth" to the "teaching minister."

We insert, in conclusion, an extract from "Conder's Protestant Non-Conformity," a very able work, treating of the fundamental principles of ecclesiastical policy. It is not the work of a Newchurchman, but it contains

ideas very much in accordance with New Church principles, and for ourselves we regard the following extract as decidedly of that character.

“Truth by whomsoever it is promulgated, cannot but possess the same intrinsic authority. The fact that an individual does or does not preach the truth of Christ, cannot be made to depend upon any hypothesis respecting his having, or his not having, the right to preach it. If he preaches the Gospel, the fact is placed beyond dispute that he is competent to the exercise of the Christian ministry, and what is there that can be interposed between the competence and the right? Were our assent required to this position, that it is not every one who chooses to assume the ministerial function that is competent to discharge it with fidelity and efficacy, there would be no difficulty in coming to an agreement; but the advocates of ecclesiastical restrictions, proceed upon the supposition that the self-constituted teacher *is* possessed of the requisite knowledge, the moral competency; a thing very different from mere choice; nevertheless, his right and his authority are represented as dependent on human appointment. If, however, as we believe, this authority is of a purely spiritual nature, and the preaching of the Gospel is one of those religious actions, which are not subject to magisterial control, while we deny that any man may preach merely because he chooses, we affirm that his choice, which may possibly spring from a sense of duty, is a sufficient reason in the sight of man. A person cannot be said to believe because he *chooses* to believe; he does not understand that which he preaches because he *chooses* to understand it. The will is not itself the adequate cause of such voluntary actions. If there is any truth in the Scripture declaration, that ‘the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned, but he that is spiritual judgeth all things,’—then, we must admit that a capacity for preaching the Gospel with intelligence, is not a matter dependent either on human fancy on the one hand,

or on political regulations on the other. The usurpation of the sacred office by incompetent persons, is an evil which the interposition of ecclesiastical restrictions is ill adapted to mitigate.

“But further: every individual has a natural right to the free assertion and argumentative maintenance of his own opinions, provided those opinions are not subversive of social order. If no objection lies against the nature of his sentiments, no criminality can attach to the most unreserved expression of them. It would be indeed strange that this natural right should be lessened in proportion to the certain truth and supreme importance of what he teaches. Yet those who would restrict the exercises of the Christian ministry, rest their arguments on this consideration, that it is the Gospel which is preached. The objection is taken not against the truth of what is taught, but against the authority of the teacher, as if his natural freedom in respect of the assertion of what he knows to be true, and feels to be infinitely consequential, underwent some mysterious modification, when the truths which he labors to propagate relate to the salvation of the soul. ‘Master,’ said the disciples to our Lord, ‘we saw one casting out demons in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us.’ Our Lord’s reply stands on record as a reproof of the officious zeal of those who, in a similar spirit of worldly wisdom and sectarian policy, would impose laws on the church which Christ has not imposed, and exclude from the ministry those whom he has not excluded:—‘Forbid him not; for he that is not against us, is for us.’—‘Wherefore I give you to understand,’ says St. Paul, when treating expressly of spiritual gifts, and of the essential unity of the Church, ‘that no man speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed, and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost. There are diversities of operation, but it is the same God, which worketh all in all.’ Neither the right, then, to exercise the ministerial function, nor the authority annexed to it, originates in the will, or is dependent upon the appointment, of man.

\* \* \* \* \*

“ Every faithful preacher of the Gospel, in fulfilling the will of Christ, claims to be considered as invested with a necessary *ministerial authority* ; an authority simply and entirely resulting from the message which he promulgates and the command which he fulfils ; an authority under which the Christian evangelist goes forth to execute a commission extending to all nations, and to every individual of every nation under heaven ; a moral or rather spiritual authority, distinct from the pastoral jurisdiction, which rests upon particular relations originating in appointment and choice ; distinct from whatsoever has its source in the will of man ; and attaching to whomsoever, as the bearer of the evangelical message, we may regard as the organ of Christ. The ministry is of necessity one in kind : it must, therefore, as regards the discharge of it by any individual, be either that of ‘ the Spirit of truth,’ or of ‘ the Spirit of error ;’ it is either efficient, as the preaching of Christ, or it is wholly inefficient and unauthorized. Official designation, ecclesiastical dignity, can make no difference in the character of the ministry exercised by any man in the Church of Christ. The humblest self-constituted teacher, who is possessed of the appropriate credentials of the ministerial character, in the purity of his doctrines, the success of his labors, and the unblemished tenor of his life, is invested with an *authority* to which no circumstantial additaments of human appointment are requisite to impart validity ; it requires no sanction from man, for with man it does not originate. A preacher may be undeniably deficient in some of those subsidiary qualifications which constitute a *natural fitness* for the office of teacher ; but the capacity for preaching the truth of Christ, so as to fulfil the purposes of the Christian ministry, is, let it never be forgotten, a spiritual capacity ; and where this is possessed, it is in vain, and worse than in vain, for us to withhold our recognition of the essential character and authority of the Christian minister as existing in that individual, how humble soever his station

or his acquirements. With the utmost propriety such a man may appeal to those to whose consciences he has been commended by the efficacy of his pious labors : ' If I be not ' a minister ' unto others, yet doubtless I am to you ; for the seal of my ' ministry ' are ye in the Lord. ' "—*Prot. Non-Com.* vol. i. p. 166–174.

.

## THE MINISTRY.

LETTER FROM REV. T. O. PRESCOTT.

[N. C. Repos., May, 1850.]

MR. EDITOR,

My attention has been attracted by reports in your Magazine, and also by the article in the last No. of the New Church Quarterly on the subject of the Ministry, lay-preaching, ordination, &c. I was also reading, a day or two since, your remarks on the subject of your own ordination, in the July No. of the Repository. These things, my dear sir, have brought my ideas in some degree to a focus on the subject of the ministry, and I should like to have a little conversation with you on this important topic. I am a lover of freedom, and at the same time a lover of order. I am desirous to see maintained the greatest degree of freedom consistent with Divine and Heavenly order, and the real good of the church and of individuals, and I feel anxious to discover what is the true medium. I believe your own mind to be in a similar state in this respect. Perhaps, then, a little comparison of views on this subject would aid both of us.

The way I look at the institution of the ministry, is somewhat as follows : First, I believe the ministry to be, both from the teachings of the Word, and the writings of the Church, as also from all historical evidence, from the conclusions of reflection and common sense, and from a consideration of the wants of mankind, a *distinct office and use*. Setting aside other grounds for such a belief, I think the teachings of the Church entirely explicit on this point. Priests and the priesthood and the clergy are spoken of everywhere in the writings, as a distinct office, filled by a distinct class of individuals. This is so manifest that, as it seems to me, no one can have a doubt of it, but one who has made up his mind, and persists in holding another view. Numberless quotations might be made from the writings upon this point, but it is needless, for it pervades their whole tenor. The view, therefore, contained in one of the reports before referred to, that all internal men who have learned interior doctrine and confirmed it by the Word, are meant by the clergy, and that all who from love to the Lord and charity to the neighbor are in truth, &c., are meant by "teaching ministers"—surprised me exceedingly; the serious holding up of such a view seemed to me to argue rather a spirit of ingenuity, and desire to support a preconceived opinion, than wisdom or truth. That it is quite unsound may be seen by a single quotation from the writings. In heaven all certainly are internal men (at least in the higher heavens), and all there are in truths from love and charity; yet even there we are taught that preachers are a distinct

class, and that "it is not allowed any except them to teach in the temples," *H. & H.* 226; and in *T. C. R.* 661, one of these, named as the "high priest," and calling himself "minister of the church" in heaven, is described and presented to view.

But, in the second place, if ministers or the clergy be a distinct body of individuals, by whom should they be appointed to their office? In heaven, as we learn, they are appointed, as all officers are, directly by the Lord: but in this lower world, this duty, like every other, is left to man to perform, "acting in freedom according to reason." How then should they be appointed? Should it be by *other* ministers? I cannot see any principle on which they should. As to the figment of "Apostolic succession," we know from our author, *A. R.* 802, as properly quoted in the report above mentioned, that the notion of transferring the Holy Spirit from one man to another, was a mere invention from the Babylonish love of dominion. But shall a man appoint himself? In other words, is it proper or expedient that every one who chooses should declare himself a minister of the church, and proceed to exercise the functions of the office? I answer, *No!* for two or three reasons. One is, that it is well known, and any one of observation must have been struck with the fact, that it is not always those who think themselves qualified, and who have a desire to preach, who *are* qualified for the work. I have been struck with this myself, in several instances. It is often not a spiritual love of use, evidently, that prompts such desire, or even the "genius stirring within," or the spirit of the Lord at all, but sometimes a mere love of display, or a high opinion of one's own intelligence, or the desire of distinction, which is at the bottom. The true preachers, as biography shows, are those men who have been reluctant to come forward, who had to be forced almost into the office, by their friends, who knew their fitness (in the biographies of Massillon, Fenelon, Augustine, Chrysostom, and many others). And this backwardness, I can easily understand, is the effect of the very power and spirit moving in the centre of their souls, and giving light to their minds, which by its very brilliancy at once interiorly urges them on, and yet makes them shrink from the great and high duty, which the Spirit presents to them to be done. Just as the common mind thinks it can do anything while the man of genius is cautious and timid, and fearful he cannot bring into act the grand conceptions that burn within him.

Thus, then, it is no criterion of a man's fitness to preach, that he has a desire to preach. But another and an unanswerable reason why a man should not appoint himself is, that it is not a private office but a *public* one. The whole church has an interest at stake in its preachers. They stand in a manner as its representatives before the world; and their character, both intellectual and moral, will affect greatly the estimation in which will be held both the opinions which they utter, and also the members who entertain those opinions. This being the case, the whole church has a right to have a voice in the

appointment of the ministers of the church. Nay, there is no way in which that general voice can express itself so justly or truly, nor indeed do I perceive any other practicable way, than through the Annual Conference or Convention, which is the nearest approximation to a representation of the church at large (or in a country as extensive as the United States, perhaps a *State Association* would be a body sufficiently general). This, then, my dear sir, is the simple and obvious reason, in my opinion, why the Convention should appoint the ministers of the church; and why it is not right for an individual or for any single society or small body to appoint a minister; because, a minister, once appointed, does become, by custom and courtesy, if by no other rule, the representative, and is received as the minister of the church at large. Therefore the church at large has an interest in, and should have a voice in, the appointment.

But in the next place, the person thus appointed, chosen, or approved of (or *recognized*, as you express it) by the church in general, is then, by the laws of Divine order, as we are expressly taught, to be introduced into the office by an orderly form of inauguration; and we are taught distinctly also what that form is, viz., "imposition of hands," which represents or corresponds to *communication* (See *Divine Love and Wisdom*, 220; *A. C.* 6292). We are also expressly taught, *T. C. R.* 146, that certain gifts and aids attend that inauguration and are imparted with it from the Lord, as illustration, &c. Now, the way I understand this somewhat difficult point, is thus: not that a man can be made a minister, or become fitted for the office, *solely* by this inauguration—by no means; but simply that one already in general fitted by the proper talents from the Lord, education, &c., has his fitness completed or perfected by the influx that attends orderly introduction into the office. Just as baptism or the Holy Supper *alone* will save no one, but yet will be a *help*, and will bring increased spiritual influences to him who does the work of regeneration otherwise—who believes in the Lord and keeps his commandments.

The question has been sometimes raised, Who in such cases may perform the right of imposition of hands. May any one, or may only a minister? I would reply that to my mind it is certainly a function that belongs to the ministerial office; for we are taught in *A. C.* 10,799, that priests are appointed for the administration of those things that relate to the divine law and worship. It belongs to that office just as the administration of Baptism and the Holy Supper belongs to it. Not that the Holy Spirit or any power whatever passes from the minister himself to the person ordained (as is the idea of the "Apostolic succession" principle), for all the gifts that attend inauguration into the ministry are communicated doubtless from the Lord alone; but simply, because, according to the quotation just made, all functions and ceremonies relating to the divine law and worship, belong to the ministerial office, just as civil duties belong to a civil office, &c.; and order requires that these distinctions should be observed.



But here it is to be noticed, that the mere performing of the ceremony of ordination by a minister, and his appointing another to the office of the ministry (which are sometimes confounded), are two perfectly distinct things, and have no connection with each other whatever. It has already been shown, that ministers should be appointed, that is, chosen or approved of, by the church at large: the minister simply performs the ceremony upon those thus appointed:—just as it is not for a minister to say who shall be baptized or who shall partake of the Holy Supper; he simply administers the ordinance to those who present themselves or are presented. A minister, indeed, should have his voice or his vote in the appointment, like every other member of the Convention. The judgment of the ministers present at the Convention will, indeed, naturally be consulted on an occasion of this kind. Since they have in some respects a peculiar fitness for judging of the candidate's intellectual and educational qualifications, and therefore such applications might with propriety be referred to them for their farther opinion; still, however, the decision will be with the whole body of members.

You will observe that my remarks, thus far, have been directed to this point, or these points, viz.: that there is in the church a distinct office of the ministry; that there is and should be a distinct body of individuals who fill that office; that these should be appointed, approved of, or recognized by the Church at large, or a body that represents it; that when so appointed, they should be inaugurated into the office by an orderly form, which should be performed by the hands of a minister, the effect of which inauguration has also been touched upon. Thus my object has been to show that, as the writings teach, there is and should be a regular ministry in and for the New Church. And I have dwelt upon this, because there seem to be floating doubts in some minds in regard to it, or at least loose ideas concerning it.

Now, there is another topic of interest, which is quite distinct from this, and should not be confounded with it, viz.: the question of *lay preaching*; that is, whether (admitting that there is a regular ministry, &c.) it is still allowable for laymen, or persons not ministers, to teach and preach the doctrines of the Church, when they seem to have the ability and inclination to do so. This, as before said, is a distinct question. And it is one, I confess, of difficulty. It is certain that the writings teach (in A. C. 6822) that preaching, or the public teaching of truth, belongs to the ministerial office, and that there is danger arising from an indiscriminate exercise of this function. And, probably, when the church becomes fully and wisely established, this order of things can and will be strictly observed. But in the present incipient state of the Church, where there are few regular ministers, where there is much to be done, and so few to do it; when it is difficult in many places to support a minister in the sole uses of his office; and when the reception of the new truth kindles a desire to make it known to others. I do not know whether it would be wise or necessary to put too close a restriction on the efforts of individual members

in this respect. I do not perceive that any serious harm could arise (and perhaps some good might) from an individual, not a minister, giving an occasional lecture, or course of lectures, on the doctrines, when so disposed and when desired by those who may wish to be instructed. At the same time I think that it would be the more orderly course—when a layman finds himself led on, from giving an occasional lecture, to the regular delivery of discourses—to obtain the recognition and approbation of his brethren of the church at large, as expressed through their proper organ, the Convention, or any of the State Associations. This might be expressed in the form of a *license*, as hitherto common in the church in the United States, which *license* I regard as simply meaning an expression of opinion on the part of the church in general, that the person so licensed is properly fitted for the duty or use of preaching the doctrines; not that such a license is supposed to have in it any power of conferring fitness, nor that it means to imply any authoritative forbidding of any one else to open his lips (as some seem to have conceived), but that it is simply a *recognition* of fitness in the person so licensed. And the asking of such a recognition is *orderly* and proper, because, as before shown, a public teacher of the doctrines becomes in some degree a representative of the whole Church, and its character; and the whole church, therefore, has a direct interest in seeing that such teachers are worthy and properly qualified. I think that no one, with such a spirit of humility and self-distrust, as is becoming a teacher of spiritual truth, could object to such a course; and he would find his hands strengthened by pursuing it—by feeling that he has the publicly expressed approbation of his brethren. Such licentiate might then be regarded as a candidate for the ministry, and as preparing himself to be admitted into it in an orderly manner, when circumstances permitted, and a proper opportunity offered.

This is the way, my dear sir, in which the subject of *lay preaching* presents itself, after much reflection to my mind. And it seems to me a course which would put no unnecessary restriction on individual freedom, and yet would tend to preserve due order. You observe the points are two: *first*, there is no objection to any receiver of the doctrines, who feels so disposed, giving an occasional lecture, or course of lectures; but, *secondly*, that if he finds himself led into a regular and habitual course of public teaching, or preaching, that then it would be orderly that he, or his friends for him, should make application to the Convention or State Association, for their approbation expressed in the form of a *license*, which there is no fear would be refused to any one truly worthy, both as to ability and moral character.

In regard, however, to the administration of the ordinances of Baptism and the Holy Supper by laymen, or those not in the office of the ministry (a question which has also been occasionally agitated), I must express the opinion that it seems to me quite contrary to due order and unwarrantable. These are duties properly and strictly belonging to the office of the ministry or priesthood, as may be seen from a reference to *A. C.* 10,799, where it is declared that “priests are ap-

pointed for the *administration* of those things that relate to the Divine law and worship." It is a case quite different from that of publicly teaching or preaching the doctrines. Every man who has the knowledge of truth will naturally have a wish to express his thoughts in regard to it, either privately to one or a few, or publicly to many ; so that every receiver of truth is naturally, in some degree, a teacher or communicator of it to others. But to perform a religious ceremony, to administer a sacred and solemn ordinance of the church, is altogether another thing. No one does this by nature ; he must go out of his way to do it ; it is an extraordinary not an ordinary thing. And in doing it, he is entering upon functions that belong to a distinct office, established in the church both on earth and in heaven, for the express purpose of performing such holy administrations. Neither is there the necessity for it that there may be for the other. The teaching of truth is a work which has to be widely carried on, and continually kept up, for the enlightenment and salvation of mankind ; many hands must be incessantly engaged in it. But the administration of the ordinances of Baptism and the Holy Supper, is only an occasional thing, that may without much inconvenience or injury be deferred till such time as the services of an authorized minister of the church can be obtained.

These, my dear sir, are some of the thoughts which have presented themselves to my mind on the subject of the ministry in the New Church. If you think the publication of them will be of any service I have no objection to it.

I remain, dear sir, truly,

Your brother in the Lord,

T. O. PRESCOTT.

Glasgow, March, 1850.

As the above article or argument by our transatlantic brother presents what may probably with justice be regarded as the prevalent view of the Ministry obtaining in the New Church, and as it differs very materially from our own, we shall embrace the opportunity to enlarge a little upon the general subject. The particular replies which, under other circumstances, we should perhaps offer to the several points made in Mr. Prescott's communication, we shall leave our readers to educe for themselves from the scope of our remarks. As a whole, the theme is one of vast extent and complex relations, and it will be almost inevitable that we fail, in some point or other, to do full justice to the argument. We may leave our positions open to an interrogation which, because unanswered,

may appear on a cursory glance unanswerable. But our fundamental grounds will claim the chief attention ; and if these are sound, the minor matters of detail will readily right themselves in the reader's mind.

A correct idea of the Ministry in the Lord's New Church cannot be formed apart from a perception of the true genius and ends of that Church in contradistinction from those of the Old Church, as practically conceived and acted on, against which it virtually arrays itself in nearly every particular. The individual man in the Old Church is held in abeyance ; in the New he is brought forward and elevated. Every man of the Church is a church itself in the least form. Freedom and rationality are his grand characteristics, and for any man to waive the exercise of these is to surrender his most distinctive prerogatives. Each individual must see truth for himself, and order his life according to it, or he can have no claim to discipleship in the New Jerusalem. Still, as there are states of instruction in the progress of regeneration, so there is a corresponding office of teaching, and one which grows in an orderly way out of the nature of the case. It is the normal product of the exigencies of men's states, and is primarily referable to the law of charity, which dictates that one who has more of good and truth should impart of his abundance to him that has less ; and it is not to be questioned that Swedenborg, for the most part, treats the subject of ministry under the head of *charity*, of which it is one prominent department. Exciting good and imparting truth is spiritually feeding the hungry and clothing the naked, as every one knows who has himself received any adequate measure of this species of benefaction. Action of this nature towards its appropriate objects is the very law of the regenerate life. It requires not that a man should be called by official designation to exercise the functions of neighborly love. Such an universal duty cannot be exclusively confined to any distinct class or caste.

This will be more evident if we look at the primitive

formation of a society of the New Church, or of any Church. A community of this kind is one of an entirely voluntary character, composed of individuals drawn together from interior affinities and for a common end. They propose to themselves the instituting of divine worship, and the mutual edification of each other. They agree to walk together in the ordinances of the Lord's house, and somewhat of a mutual covenant is implied in the union. Their relation to each other is more than that of mere aggregation. It involves the idea of organization. There is, in the first place, a community of spirit, of interest, of aims, operating as an attractive force to draw them together, and then there is a kind of spiritual crystallization, which brings them into an organized form. It is wholly immaterial in what manner the associative influence first begins to operate. It may be from preaching, or it may be from reading. But the right of Christian believers thus to come together, and to organize themselves into a society, is a primary and indefeasible right, derived from the Lord himself, and ratified in the explicit declaration, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." This is the charter of heaven under which any number of Christians is as fully authorized to form themselves as a banking company among men in the business world is at liberty to avail itself of the general law to that effect. For the exercise of this right they are not dependent upon any other society, or upon any clergyman. They are at full liberty to form themselves into such a fraternity in obedience to the Lord's will, and with a view to secure its appropriate ends. At the same time we admit that if they can conveniently enjoy the presence and concurrence of their brethren in the faith, or that of an acknowledged clergyman on such an occasion, it is well; only let it be understood that all such persons are present as helpers and not as authorizers of their proceedings. To these they are amply competent in themselves, being authorized from the highest possible source; and it may sometimes be important, for

the sake of a more emphatic assertion of Christian liberty, to decline any other co-operation on the part of laity or clergy from abroad, than that of their brotherly sympathies and good wishes.

Supposing, then, such a society of the New Church to be duly formed, it is obvious that the performance of use, bearing upon the general interests of the Lord's kingdom, is the great end which they are ever to have in view. But as use is governed by quality, their first and paramount aim is to be, to render themselves, according to the laws of divine order, of such a quality as shall enable them to achieve the largest amount of good, each to the other, and all to each; beside what they are enabled to render to the world at large. The action of such a society is a kind of secretion of spiritual use, just as the secretion of an organ in the human body tends to the conservation and well being of the whole. And as every particle of every organ contributes its share in the elaborating process, so is each individual in such a society to furnish his respective quota of influence to the perfection of the whole. In this respect they all stand upon an equal footing. In the common aim of the whole every member has an equal interest. The humblest disciple has as much at stake as the highest and most distinguished. His soul is of as much importance, his comfort and prosperity in spiritual things as much an object of Divine and angelic care, as that of his otherwise more favored brother, and he in like manner is under equal obligation to study in his place and relations the best good of the entire body. All this, be it observed, lies upon the society from its very inception, and prior to the appointment of any one or more individuals to what is termed the clerical or ministerial office; for in the nature of the case, the particular church or society must be prior to its ministers, just as any civil society or government is prior to its officers. In this primitive state of things every one is virtually and potentially a minister, preacher, or priest, because every one is a church in the least form. Nor do we see any adequate

reason why this prerogative should be considered as *ever* alienable from its rightful subjects. The exercise of it may be waved to a greater or less degree under peculiar circumstances, as when the superior gifts of one, in any particular department, may supersede for a time those of another; but so far as the principle is concerned, we hold it undeniable that every man of the church, from the necessity of things, is potentially a minister. And in this matter it is important to hold fast to first principles, for it is here that usurpation generally makes its entrance, by falsifying or sophisticating some fundamental truth, and making it, thus transformed, the basis of a system of tyrannous domination and oppression.

But it will be asked, Is there no such thing as a distinct function of teaching or preaching in the New Church? Can anything be more obvious than the recognition of such a function, both in the Word and in the writings of the Church? And if there is to be teaching, must there not be teachers? Does not a function imply functionaries, or men discharging what Mr. Prescott terms "a distinct office and use?" If all are teachers, where are the taught? If all are leaders, where are the led? To this we reply, that diversity of uses in the Lord's spiritual body does not necessarily create diversity of *grades* in those who perform such uses. We acknowledge at once the necessity of teaching and of teachers in the Church; but we deny that this fact lays a foundation for that radical distinction of *clergy* and *laity* which has obtained currency throughout Christendom, and which has opened a Pandora's box of evils and mischiefs to the church of the past. The New Church of the present and the future is not a church in representatives, but in realities. The substantial things which the priesthood represented are now enjoyed by the general body composing the New Jerusalem, and being diffused throughout the whole of that body, they cannot be appropriated or monopolized by any one class. New Church societies on earth are now to form themselves more and more on the model of the societies of the New

Church in the heavens, and with these there is no *preaching priesthood*. There is indeed a priesthood, but it is composed of the whole celestial kingdom, and the men of that kingdom never preach. There are also preachers in the heavens ; but as they are not priests, being of the spiritual kingdom, so they are not constituted preachers by a self-perpetuating order, but receive their appointment directly from the Lord, and that too, as we may reasonably infer, by the operation and influx of his Spirit flowing into their minds, and generating both the love and the ability for the use which they are thence called to perform. Their gifts and endowments are perceived by the society to be adapted to their exigencies, and they receive and acknowledge them in this relation. They do not confer any power upon them : they do not, strictly speaking, appoint them ; they simply acknowledge them as qualified, and thereby designated by the Lord himself to officiate in this capacity in the performance of a use which their states render requisite. Such individuals fall into the centre, instead of the circumference, as a matter of course, and in an orderly state of things it is just as natural that their peculiar province should be recognized and acknowledged as that the corporeal system at large should acknowledge the all-pervading and sustaining action of the heart. But we see nothing in all this that necessarily constitutes them a permanently distinct class, invested with any kind of rule or authority other than that which emanates from the truths they communicate. They are to the whole society what a particular organ is to the whole human body. To the eye, for instance, pertains the function of seeing, but it cannot see apart from the body to which it belongs. So with the ear, the nose, the tongue. They all have their several uses in the bodily economy, but they are not on this account in any manner *distinct* from the body. So in like manner the use or function of teaching or preaching in the societies of the New Church does not constitute a *distinct grade* or *order* in such societies, discriminated from the mass as the *clergy* are



now supposed to be discriminated from the *laity*—a distinction equivalent to a discrete degree.

We are well aware how difficult it will be for many of our readers to rest in our conclusion, that there may be a distinction in use which does not amount to a distinction in office, or rather in official order or caste. Nor are we sure that we can make our idea any more intelligible by expansion or illustration. If it does not strike the mind with somewhat of an intuitive perception, it will not probably be apprehended after pages of elaborate exposition. We would say, however, that by the distinct order or office of the clergy in the church, we mean an order *which perpetuates itself* by some special form of ordination or inauguration, wherein the body of the church, or the *laity*, as they are termed, have no share. That such an order of men, whether called priests, clergymen, or ministers, was designed to exist in the New Church is what we venture to deny; while at the same time we freely admit and strenuously maintain that there is a function of teaching which is to be discharged by those who have the requisite qualifications therefor. If these two propositions are deemed inconsistent with and destructive of each other, so it must be. In our view they are not.

The function of teaching in a wider sense, or of preaching or proclaiming the gospel as an evangelist or missionary to the world at large, we would place on the broad ground of a general right of all men to utter and enforce by argument such sentiments as they may entertain on any subject whether secular or sacred. Especially, if no exceptions are taken to the sentiments themselves, there can be do just exceptions taken to the most free and unreserved expression of them by their holders. This open and free declaration of opinion is the more legitimate import of the word *preach*, which is derived from a root expressive of the office of a *public crier*, a *proclaimer*, or *herald* of tidings whether good or bad. When the tidings are good it is *gospel*, another name for the good news, *par excellence*, of the kingdom of heaven,

and we would ask how much ecclesiastical authority one requires to empower him to declare the glad tidings of the Lord's second advent, especially when we learn that every one to whom the message comes is to be an echo to its gracious burden; "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. *And let him that heareth say, Come.* And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." Is not this a sufficient commission?

The origin, then, we contend, of the ministry in the New Church is in the exigencies of the society. The office is necessarily created by the spiritual demands of the members. Certain gifts are in requisition, and the possession of the gifts, together with the genuine love of the use, is the warrant for their exercise. The divine influx is into the use, and the thing is orderly of course. The true ministerial function is therefore intrinsically prior to all ordination administered by man, for we are now in quest of the manner in which the very first minister becomes such. We are endeavoring to re-mount to the primo-primitive source of a New Church ministry. We have seen that it is merely one form of that complex of uses which pertains to a society of New Church Christians. It is a use of serving rather than of ruling. A *minister* is a *servant*, and not a lord or master; this is the very meaning of the term. But the service of the church is multiform, and so is the ministry. As every member has a service to perform, so he has a ministry to discharge, and nothing would be more pernicious than to regard the employment of a teaching minister as carrying with it a *supersedeas* to all other forms of spiritual service.

But here we can easily foresee that the claims of *order* will be urged. Is it not opening the door to confusion and every evil work to concede such license on the score of preaching or teaching? Will it not be a grievous infraction of order and a serious periling of the best interests of the Church if the seal of sanctity be taken off from the clerical office, and the current distinction between clergy and laity virtually done away? As the

office is a public office and the good name and well-being of the church is at stake, should there not be an express authority conferred before any one assumes to himself the responsibility of the function? Does not the church need protection against the inroads of false teachers and unworthy representatives? Our answer to this will suggest itself from the tenor of what goes before. The question fairly arises, if our premises are sound, where the authority sought resides. As the office of teaching grows directly out of the wants of a society, and its authority lies in its use, the existence of a ministry cannot depend upon an antecedent ordaining clergy any more than an effect can re-act and re-produce its cause. The ministry of a society ante-dates that of an order of clergy pertaining to the church at large, granting for the present that such an order may exist.

If the view now presented be still thought to be pregnant with evil results, it behoves us to look well to the remedies proposed and see whether they may not, in the long run, involve greater evils than those they are intended to cure or prevent. This they will surely do if they conflict with genuine order and virtually deny first principles of truth or freedom. It is not unusual to hear it said that persons not duly inducted should not be *allowed* to officiate in the ministry. But who is authorized to prevent them, and whence came the power? What are the credentials shown for it? Is not every man at liberty to utter his sentiments on any subject that he deems of moment to his fellow-men, and even if those sentiments should be intrinsically erroneous or mischievous, are not the evils incident to a restraining power greater than any that could flow from the most unlimited freedom of speech? So we sometimes hear men talk about certain portions of the human race not being fit for civil freedom. But whence arose the right of one portion of mankind to judge for another on this score? Does not God create all men free? How has it happened that one class of men deems itself entitled to sit in judgment on the capacity of another to enjoy

the birthright with which the Creator endowed them? And how can they restrict this right without injustice and oppression? We do not of course say that all men *are* equally prepared to use civil freedom without abusing it, but we do say that this fact does not annul the original right, and that the evils of usurped coercion are greater in the final issue than those of self-asserted liberty.

So in the matter before us. We know of no authority, no tribunal, which is empowered to restrain the exercise of any man's freedom in the proclamation of what he regards as truths of the most solemn import. If such a prompting proceed from the working of genuine neighborly love it will act in wisdom and will be acknowledged by those endowed with spiritual perception, for wisdom is justified of her children. If the voice of the shepherd is heard in such a man, the sheep will turn towards him, but not otherwise, for they do not know the voice of a stranger. But men are as free in the matter of hearing as of speaking. No one can be compelled to hear what he does not wish to hear, or what, upon hearing once, he does not wish to hear again. If an individual assuming to be of the New Church faith preaches a doctrine at variance with her truths, there is no remedy but in the sounder views which it may encounter in the minds of the hearers, and in the rectifications of time and Providence. In the end truth will eliminate and vindicate itself from the perversions of error, and though the injury done in the mean time in the name of the New Church is to be regretted, yet the violent suppression of an inborn right would be still more to be deplored. On the whole, therefore, the evils resulting by possibility from this source do not strike us as being so formidable as might appear to a slight reflection. Human prudence is prone to multiply the fancied safeguards of truth, when in fact it is most effectually panoplied by its own inherent might.

The foregoing train of remark does, if we mistake not, develope somewhat of the nature and design of the New Church ministry. It is not an office of ruling, except so

far as truth itself is of a ruling nature when presented to the mind. It is simply one form of the multifarious uses which are requisite to the building up of the church in the goods and truths of the Lord's kingdom, and one too, as we conceive, which was never intended to be made so completely paramount to every other use as it has come to be in the Christian world at large. It was never designed to be erected into an institution which should stand complete by itself as a virtual hierarchy. That such has been the case we attribute to the subtle working, in all deceivableness of unrighteousness, of the love of dominion which has never found a more congenial abode than in the bosom of the clergy. This spirit will never lack logic to justify its usurpations, and its *proton pseudos*, its fundamental falsity will ever be found to lie in asserting a radical distinction between the *clergy* and the *laity*, whereas if this sophism is exposed the whole system receives a death-blow and totters to its fall. We would not be understood by this as involving the clergy of the present day in the odium of devising and consciously upholding a system of sacerdotal dominion. Far from it. We believe them to be conscientious and well-intentioned men, aiming to do the will of God in sincerity, and we impute their error to too readily taking for granted the soundness of opinions and usages which have come down to them by inheritance, and which, from their being so seldom questioned, they have had but little reason to doubt.

We cannot for ourselves but indulge the hope that the New Church will eventually develope an entirely new order of things in this respect, and that while everything essential to the ministry will be retained, everything factitious will be discarded. How, otherwise, can any sign of promise be read in the Church's future? As to an adequate supply of regularly and canonically ordained ministers for the various societies of receivers spread over the length and breadth of the land, who shall receive their support from such societies, it surely is now and must be for a long time to come wholly out of the

question. Indeed this is a fact that holds good not of the New Church only, but of all Churches. There is beginning to be an alarming deficit of clergymen—alarming, I mean, to all those who look upon the clergy, as we do not, as the very bone and bulwark of the church. The prevailing spirit of wordliness, or the higher prizes of other walks of life, is continually thinning the ranks of the candidates for the ministry—which, however, had probably better be thin if such motives can make them so. Now for ourselves we do not regard this as in itself a circumstance to be deeply dreaded by the New Church, however it may be with others. It will throw her upon her own resources—upon her *lay* resources. She will be forced to wean herself from that dependence upon the ministry which has been so much the bane of Christendom, and which is not without its ill effects in the New Dispensation. Although it is unquestionable that the man of the New Church is to be built up more by reading than the man of any other church, yet the inveterate prepossessions in regard to the *stated ministry* are continually tending to relax and paralyze individual action and to beget an unconscious reliance upon a substituted agency in matters of religion. The latent impression is almost inevitable, that as the minister or pastor is paid for his services, the entire conduct of the religious affairs of the society is devolved upon him, and that the duties of the rest are discharged by contributing their due proportion to his support, and sitting with exemplary regularity under his preaching from Sabbath to Sabbath. As a general fact men are about as willing to *pay* to be excused, as they are to *pray* to be excused, from the duties which make somewhat of a stringent demand upon the inner man.

One effect of this state of things in the New Church is very disastrous. Scattered over the country in towns and villages are little bands of receivers who have become such by reading. And as they are too weak to support a pastor, so they are prone to regard themselves as too weak to keep up worship or even to form them-

selves into societies. They therefore remain in an isolated state, making little or no united effort to promote their spiritual weal, but waiting for the Lord to increase their numbers and with their numbers their means. Consequently everything for the present languishes, though they may, by private reading, keep up a faint life of goodness and truth in their own souls, and walk unimpeachably in the outer man. But why should they not meet in little clubs for reading and conference, and thus form the germs of future societies? The writings of the Church are a never failing fund of edification, and there is usually some one or more individuals in these circles, of intelligence and ability, and well qualified to take the lead and to communicate instruction. Why do not such receivers avail themselves of their inalienable privilege? Why do they not at least combine their resources and furnish themselves with the writings of the New Church, and with an abundance of collateral works for general distribution? Alas, we fear that the grand let and hindrance on this score is to be found in the exorbitant views entertained of the ministry as a kind of *sine qua non* as much to the being as the well-being of the Church. They have, from traditional teachings, taken up the idea that a settled and salaried preacher is an indispensable element in every such body, and that there can be no such thing as a lay circumference without a clerical centre. Now we do not hesitate to say that the sooner this idea is got rid of the better. If every truly good man is a church in the least form, any number of receivers associated according to the laws of the Lord's kingdom is no less a church in a larger form, and competent to the performance of all the appropriate uses of such a body. That it is possible in such circumstances for self-complacent and aspiring spirits, "loving to have the pre-eminence," to thrust themselves forward to the disparagement of worthier men, must indeed be admitted. But the true remedy for this is the cultivation of the true spirit of the Church, which is a spirit of modesty, of self-distrust, of retiring humility, while at the same

time it is a spirit that shrinks not from any plainly enjoined duty or service of use. Contingent evils ought not to be allowed to bear down and frustrate divinely instituted goods. "It is not always those," says Mr. Prescott, "who think themselves qualified and who have a desire to preach, who *are* qualified. It is often not a spiritual love of use that prompts such desire, but sometimes a mere love of display, or a high opinion of one's own intelligence, or the desire of distinction which is at the bottom." Granted, but what then? Are there not those who *have* a true love of use, and who are *not* prompted by the corrupt motives here recited; and shall they be precluded from a sphere of useful action in the Lord's church, because others may prostitute that service to the ends of vain glory? Is it, moreover, just to insinuate of such men who are drawn to this province of use by interior promptings of pure quality, that they are self-appointed if they enter upon it with the full concurrence of their brethren without passing through the prescribed church forms of clerical inauguration, which perhaps they could not do without compromising some of the clearest and most sacred convictions of their own minds?

We do not forget, in all this, that Mr. Prescott has cited chapter and verse, as it were, from our great authority on this head to which he will challenge assent, unless we are prepared to disregard it altogether. But we are at present prepared neither for the one nor the other. We respect the authority of Swedenborg, but we know nothing of a blind allegiance to the letter of particular paragraphs apart from the ruling scope and genius of the system as a whole. In reading the works of Swedenborg we recognize a certain *analogy of faith* not unlike that which the theologians of the Old Church insist upon as a necessary element in the interpretation of the inspired Word. He himself teaches the importance of referring every thing to first principles, and we could not be faithful to his lessons were we to shrink from applying the test of a rigid logic even to the rela-



tion between his own premises and conclusions, and between the parts and the whole. In the matter before us we do not see that we can be mistaken in regard to the leading scope and spirit of the system in the aggregate, nor, assuming our view of this to be correct, do we see why our inferences therefrom are not altogether legitimate and fair. Consequently if certain passages may be cited which seem, from the letter, to lead to different results, we do not feel required at once to abandon our previous ground, but will rather hold our judgment in abeyance and wait till farther light has shown how apparent discrepancies may be reconciled. It is certain that compared with the prominence which the ministry holds in the present economy of the New Church, very little is said about it by our author. He has no chapter in the "True Christian religion" devoted to that subject, nor does he anywhere treat of the church as an organized visible polity. Why is this if indeed these are matters of such vital moment to the welfare of the Lord's kingdom on earth as is to be inferred from the general estimate in which they have been held? For ourselves we do not hesitate to infer from it that the very genius of the New Church is anti-clerical, and that it is destined to work a complete revolution in the minds of its members in this respect. We cannot resist the conviction that the existing order of things in the New Dispensation, which has doubtless derived its origin from the Old, has tended greatly to impede individual regeneration, by delegating the oversight of the interests of the soul to a consecrated order of men, instead of each one being taught to consider them as entrusted to his own keeping. The effect has been to segregate the concerns of religion from the ordinary routine of life, and to give rise to a spurious pietism which virtually ignores a life of charity and use. The church and the world have been distinctly marked off and arrayed against each other as two antagonist kingdoms, instead of vigorous efforts being made to break down all artificial barriers between the two, and to infuse the true and genuine

life of the church into the world,—the complexion to which things must come at last.

But we must, perforce, bring our remarks to a close at the point we have reached, although conscious of leaving a multitude of closely-related topics altogether untouched. Future occasions may perhaps warrant more extended discussion. For the present we would simply add, that we should deem it injurious if a revolutionary character were to be charged upon the vein of our remarks. We do not propound our sentiments on the subject before us with a view to urge any sudden or violent change in the existing order of things, but simply to elicit truth, which will not fail to be adequately operative on honest minds when once clearly established. The enunciation of sound principles is always seasonable, and it is not unfrequently the case that the soundness cannot be tested apart from the enunciation. Let this be our apology or our explanation in the present instance. We have believed, therefore have we spoken.

## THE NEW JERUSALEM MAGAZINE AND THE NEW CHURCH MINISTRY.

---

[N. C. Repos., Aug. 1850.]

WE have already advertised our readers of the appearance, in the May No. of the New Jerusalem Magazine, of a somewhat caustic criticism on our Remarks upon Mr. Prescott's Letter. The Letter of Mr. P. is transferred entire with much approbation, but our appended Remarks have evidently greatly disturbed the serenity of the writer, whose initials, C. R., indicate the Editor, and filled him with alarm as to the probable consequences of the spread of sentiments so pernicious. That they should be entertained by any one in the church is indeed, as he lets us know, to be regretted, but seeing they *are* entertained, it is perhaps best that they come forth to the light and make themselves known. It is better that the mental imposthume should break and discharge itself, though it occasion a bad odor, than that it should rankle and fester within and out of reach. Though the sentiments are not likely, from their contravening the express authority of Swedenborg, and the intuitions of his disciples, to prevail to any great extent, yet "as they are put forth by one who has of late taken so prominent a post as a defender and disseminator of New Church truth and doctrine, we feel bound to take the earliest opportunity to enter our protest against them, as opposed to the teachings of Swedenborg, and disorderly and injurious in their tendency and influence." To say nothing of the insinuated charge of assumption in taking what he terms "a prominent post as a defender and disseminator of New Church truth and doctrine,"—which would probably have been a less offence had we applied at the proper ecclesiastical college for our diploma

—it must be admitted that the characterization of our strictures is not of a very soothing tone, and that of the two styles of rhetoric, the *ad conciliandum* and the *ad invidiam*, the writer manifests a decided preference for the latter. As to the implied presumption and arrogance which have marked our humble efforts to “defend and disseminate” the truths of the New Dispensation, if our critic will specify the exact point of our criminality on this score, and designate the appropriate penalty to which we ought to submit, we will promise at least to take the matter into consideration, and if we can convict ourselves of having done or of still doing wrong, we will enter our humble confession to that effect.

As to the outrage upon Swedenborg and the asserted disorder and injuriousness of our sentiments, we cannot feel greatly moved so long as we fail to perceive the truth of the allegation. Meantime we would suggest, by way of inquiry, whether the higher interests of the New Church would not be as much promoted by a tone less invidious and bitter, when speaking of the labors of those of whose *motives* charity would dictate a favorable construction on the whole.

In following the thread of our reviewer’s censures we can but barely glance at the more prominent points adverted to, and in which he has assailed the main positions of our article. Yet without extended quotations and elaborate arguments it is difficult to do justice to our views or to countervail the effect of a certain plausible sphere that diffuses itself around the paragraphs of the reply. But something may be urged *per contra*.

“In running through Professor Bush’s remarks, one of the first things which strikes the reader is, their constantly disparaging tone in regard to the ministry;—not the clergy of the present day, whom he specially excepts, as ‘conscientious and well-intentioned men,’ but the institution itself. The distinction between the clergy and the laity, is spoken of as a falsity and a sophism, and as having ‘opened a Pandora’s box of evils and mischief’s to the Church of the Past.’ We speak of this as one of the first things to strike the reader, because it is so entirely different from anything to be found in the writings of Swedenborg. Indeed, one can hardly avoid asking whether he is

really perusing the production of a professed receiver of the heavenly doctrines, or that of some of those self-styled reformers of the day, who attribute all evils to the more relations and circumstances of society, without tracing them, as Swedenborg always does, to their true source, in the loves of self and of the world."—P. 169.

The writer here manages to work himself into a surprise which is itself not a little surprising when the object of our Remarks is taken into view. What was that object? Not the disparagement of the ministry in the abstract, but simply to show that certain views entertained of the ministry—certain theories relative to the ministry as a distinct and self-perpetuating order—were incorrect. In this light, therefore, and in this alone do we speak disparagingly of the ministry, *i. e.* as an institution which, in its present form, is a perversion of true order—an opinion for which we give our reasons, such as they are. Is there anything in this which should move the critic's special wonder? So far from its being "one of the first things which strikes the reader" that we speak of the distinction between the clergy and the laity as a falsity and a sophism, it is about the only thing that will strike him at all, as this is the express and avowed drift of the Remarks from beginning to end. This C. R. would have us believe to be very surprising, "because so entirely different from anything to be found in the writings of Swedenborg." Our censor must have read Swedenborg with very different eyes from ours, if he has not found him speaking disparagingly of things which he regarded as false and as perversions of order, and this is the only point in which there is any ground for the comparison. We are speaking of the New Church, in which we deny that the peculiar distinction so long maintained hitherto between clergy and laity is to be recognized. We deny that this is fairly to be made out from Swedenborg himself, or, in other words, that our position in this matter is not accordant with his, inasmuch as we contend that he does not assert such a distinction, and that the *principles* of the New Church are inconsistent with it. What then does the writer

mean by saying that our train of remark is "so entirely different from anything to be found in the writings of Swedenborg?" If he means that there is nothing in Swedenborg to sustain our main position, he takes for granted the very point in debate, and arrays against us the example of our author for the purpose of creating odium. If he refers to the general tone or style in which Swedenborg speaks of things that he considers false or fallacious, it has certainly very little to do with the argument, besides that we are not conscious of anything more than a design to enunciate clearly and emphatically what we believe to be true, and of this mode of discussion we have ourselves found a great many specimens in Swedenborg. As to not tracing the evils in question "to their true source in the loves of self and the world," it is precisely to this origin that we refer them. The besetting sin of the clergy in all the ages of the past has been pre-eminently "the love of ruling from the love of self."

"But we almost hear our readers exclaim, what is the meaning of all this? Is not Professor Bush aware that Swedenborg not only recognizes the distinction between clergy and laity, but always treats it with the most perfect respect, and even declares the priesthood to be necessary to the preservation of order in the world, without which [i. e. order, not the priesthood] the human race must perish? (*H. D.* 311, 314.)"—P. 169.

We must of course be egregiously ignorant of the whole subject as treated by Swedenborg not to be aware of what is said in the famous chapter of the Heavenly Doctrines on Ecclesiastical and Civil Government. But we view the scope of this chapter in a very different light from that in which C. R. looks upon it. We regard it as simply a declaration of the great principles of order by which the Divine Providence governs the affairs of the world in its two leading departments, secular and sacred. We see in it no special allusion to the New Church—no formula of civil or ecclesiastical regimen to be adopted in that Church—but a comprehensive statement of the economy by which the Divine Wisdom has ever

hitherto kept the world in order, and still continues to do so. It is a summary of that grand system of agencies by which the various evil promptings of our fallen nature are controlled, and an exposé of the principles by which those ought to be governed who are called to exercise the functions of office in each of these important spheres of action. If a priesthood is a necessary appendage to the New Church it is incredible that it should not have been explicitly stated in the True Christian Religion or in some other parts of the writings. The spirit of the following passage is at any rate decidedly against it. "All things that were done in that Church (the Jewish) were turned in Heaven into corresponding representatives. But after the coming of the Lord, when external rites were abolished, and thus representatives ceased, then such things were no longer changed in Heaven into corresponding representatives; for when man becomes internal, and is instructed concerning things internal, *then external things are as nothing to him*, for he then knows what is holy, viz. that charity is so, and faith thence: from these his externals are then viewed, namely, as to how much of charity and faith towards the Lord there is in the externals: Wherefore, *since the Lord's coming, man is not considered in heaven with respect to things external, but to things internal*, if any one be considered in respect to things external, it is hence that he has simplicity, and in simplicity has innocence and charity, which are in things external, or in his external worship, from the Lord, whilst the man himself is ignorant of it."—*A. C.* 1003.

The writer goes on to make a somewhat extended quotation from our remarks in which we state our reasons for believing the New Church to be anti-clerical in its genius, notwithstanding that a contrary inference might be drawn from the letter of occasional paragraphs, and upon this extract he comments as follows:

"Here, if we understand the language, it is admitted that Swedenborg does expressly teach that the New Church should have a min-

istry, as indeed it must be impossible for any one to deny. But it is assumed in the same breath that what he thus taught in 'the letter of particular paragraphs,' is opposed to 'the ruling scope and genius of the system as a whole.' In plain English the meaning is, that Swedenborg did not understand the scope and genius of the system which he was raised up and commissioned of the Lord to expound for the instruction and benefit of mankind; and consequently that his writings already need the application of Prof. Bush's 'rigid logic,' to prune them of such antiquated and injurious excrescences as the idea of a regular and established ministry, and to show them up in the beauty of their true 'anti-clerical' character. In this matter it seems that Prof. Bush has made up his mind so clearly that he 'does not see that he can be mistaken.' There is only one alternative, and that is, that Swedenborg must be mistaken. He has indeed the modesty to speak of waiting for further light, and in the mean time of holding his judgment in abeyance. But we think it plain that he has made a mistake here, as it is not his own judgment, but Swedenborg's doctrine concerning the ministry, which he holds in abeyance."—P. 170.

We cannot well conceive anything more unfair and invidious than the complexion here given to our sentiments. In the first place it is not admitted in the passage quoted that "Swedenborg expressly teaches that the New Church should have a ministry," nor had the writer any authority for asserting it. We simply say that "we do not forget, in all this, that Mr. Prescott has cited chapter and verse, as it were, from our great authority on this head, to which he will challenge assent, unless we are prepared to disregard it altogether. But we are at present prepared neither for the one nor the other. We respect the authority of Swedenborg, but we know nothing of a blind allegiance to the letter of particular paragraphs apart from the ruling scope and genius of the system as a whole. He himself teaches the importance of referring everything to first principles, and we could not be faithful to his lessons were we to shrink from applying the test of a rigid logic even to the relation between his own premises and conclusions, and between the parts and the whole." It will be seen that it is only by violence that he extorts from these words the admission that Swedenborg "*expressly* teaches" what is affirmed. We say that Mr. Prescott has referred to certain portions



of the writings which *he understands* as sustaining his views, in which, while, for the sake of the argument, we do not deny, yet neither do we admit, that the purport of the letter favors his idea. Still we maintain that a logical consistency of interpretation requires another meaning to be put upon the language, for which we proceed to assign our reasons at some length. This the reviewer tortures into the ill-natured paragraph above, in which we are represented as virtually charging Swedenborg with being ignorant of his own system, with being mistaken, and his writings needing explication by means of our "rigid logic." If these are the weapons of New Church warfare, we have sadly mistaken its genius. Is it so very difficult for C. R. to perceive that what we mainly deny is not a *function of ministry* in the New Church, but an *office or order of clergy*, for while we hold to the one we repudiate the other; and yet C. R. would fain bring us under the odium of rejecting both. This is very much the character of the article throughout. Whatever advantage it may appear to gain is the result of thus arraying our positions in alleged antagonism with Swedenborg, and disregarding the real distinctions which we are careful to make. Thus, for instance:—"The more we have studied Swedenborg, the more fully have we been convinced not only that he was commissioned by the Lord to announce the doctrines of the New Church, and to teach and explain them in his writings, but that he was most wonderfully fitted and prepared for this high office, not merely by being imbued with their true spirit, but also with a sound wisdom and judgment in regard to all necessary details." And what of all this? Who denies it? What have we said that makes this vindication necessary? The passage has no relevancy in this connexion, except so far as it involves the implication that we had advanced something inconsistent with it, which is not the case. There is no dispute as to the endowments or authority of Swedenborg. The only question is as to his meaning. This C. R. evidently regards as so plain as to admit but of one possible

construction, and that whoever dissents from that rejects his authority. We dissent notwithstanding.

“But let us look for a moment at some of the points of Prof. Bush’s remarks, without however undertaking to examine them very fully. So far as we can gather up his chief argument against the distinction between the clergy and the laity is this. Every one is virtually and potentially a minister, preacher, or priest, because every one is a church in the least form. As, therefore, all are ministers, the distinction between clergy and laity is obliterated; because there is no longer any laity left, from which the clergy can be distinguished. But what sort of rigid logic is this? Would it not be equally just to begin with assuming, that because every one is a church in the least form, therefore every one is a layman, and cut off the distinction by thus showing that there are no clergy from which the laity can be distinguished? And the same course of reasoning would equally show that there is no distinction between kings and their subjects, magistrates and private citizens. Because every one is a church in the least form, or an individual man, therefore every one is a king and there are no subjects, or every one is a subject and there are no kings; every one is a magistrate and there are no private citizens, or every one is a private citizen and there are no magistrates, and so on throughout all the relations of society. We are not conscious that we have in the least misrepresented Professor Bush on this point, incredible as it may seem that he should take such ground. And though it has in part the appearance of a logical or syllogistic statement and inference, we regard it simply as a piece of sheer sophistry.”—Pp. 171, 172.

Our critic has not misrepresented us, neither has he confuted us, notwithstanding its being so “incredible that we should take such ground,” and notwithstanding his magisterial verdict upon it as “simply a piece of sheer sophistry.” Does not C. R. admit that Swedenborg again and again declares that “every man of the church is a church in the least form?” If he does, with what face does he venture to charge us with rejecting the authority of our illumined teacher? And why does he virtually involve this proposition in the same odium with the inference which we profess to draw *logically* from it, viz., that if every man of the church is a church in the least form, then every constituent element of the church in a larger form exists also in the church in its least form, consequently if the priesthood, ministry, or clergy is an essential principle in the one it is also in the

other? If this inference is unsound or fallacious, why not prove it to be so, still vindicating the fundamental truth from the gross perversion to which we have subjected it? But from his treatment of our position no one would know but that he rejected the premise as well as the conclusion, for he speaks of the whole without discrimination as "a piece of sheer sophistry." But let us look at *his* "rigid logic." "Would it not be equally just to begin with assuming, that because every one is a church in the least form, therefore every one is a layman, and cut off the distinction by thus showing that there are no clergy from which the laity can be distinguished? And so in like manner as to kings and subjects, magistrates and private citizens." But C. R. is in the same category with ourselves as to the admission that all good men are spiritually both priests and kings, for this is expressly declared in the Word, while it is *not* said that they are laity and subjects. It is in vain for him to deny this and still claim to be a believer in the Word, or a receiver of Swedenborg's exposition. The only question that then remains is, as to the relation which this spiritual dignity bears, in the New Church dispensation, to the outward or ultimate office so denominated. Is there *any* relation between them? In other words, is there any other than a spiritual priesthood recognized in the New Church? If so, what is it, and where have we an account of it? Let us not be answered by saying that the internal of the New Church is constituted by the priesthood or clergy, and the external by the laity, for this is an assertion that equally lacks proof, although it holds good in the Old Church. What we are authorized to demand is, the evidence that in the New Jerusalem any priesthood or clergy in ultimates is recognized by our author. *We* do not find it; and therefore we say that every man of the church, being a church in the least form, and being actually a priest in spiritual dignity, is potentially a priest in natural function as to all those services of instruction, admonition and guidance, which may be requisite for the edification of the Lord's body

on the earth. This is the true ministry of the true church. It is not the priesthood teaching the laity, for such a distinction is necessarily done away by their being all priests; but it is one portion of the spiritual priesthood teaching another, while they all stand upon the same plane. How can it be otherwise, if all are priests in the sense affirmed? If the question is alleged to have relation to another kind of priests, we ask again who they are, and what is the authority for them? How futile then the objection urged above, that we may just as well maintain that from the doing away of all distinction between the clergy and laity every man is a layman and there is no clergy. This is an objection that could never be urged but upon ground which we expressly deny, to wit, that *such* a distinction as C. R. holds between clergy and laity exists. From the express declaration of the Word that spiritual priesthood embraces *all*, there can of course be no laity in the corresponding sense. So also in regard to the royalty. If all are kings they cannot be at the same time subjects. Consequently the charge of "sheer sophistry" may as well be made to shift sides.

But the beauty of our critic's logic looms up to sight in the next paragraph, where he unequivocally endorses the very view of the subject which we have given, and which, at the same time, he is so earnest in condemning.

"Now let us look for a moment at the doctrine on this same point as taught by Swedenborg, which we briefly state thus. Every one is a church in the least form. But men are created with different capacities and tastes, fitting them for the performance of different uses; and when several are united together, who are mutually adapted to each other, they form a society or social man, or church in a larger form. This society corresponds with the respective individuals of whom it is composed. That is, it is spiritually in the human form, and the individuals of whom it is composed actually belong to the respective parts of that form to which their several uses correspond. There is, therefore, among them all the variety of function, of quality, of rank, or grade, in fine, of *distinction*, which is to be found in different parts of the human body."—P. 172.

We should confess to a great mistake in our anticipa-

tions were any sensible and candid man to peruse our article and pronounce one item of it at variance with the view here set forth as that which Swedenborg teaches. We most fully agree that the form of a New Church society is the human form, and that there is among the members "all the variety of function, of quality, of rank, or grade, in fine, of *distinction*, which is to be found in different parts of the human body." But in order that this language may be made to sustain C. R.'s view of the subject some one member or organ ought more specifically to represent the clergy than the rest of the body? To which of these, in C. R.'s opinion, does the priesthood correspond? He is very careful to affirm the analogy in general, and equally so not to define it in particular. Why not specify the items of coincidence? We are perfectly ready to admit that the function of teaching supposes in those who exercise it a more internal state than distinguishes those who are subjects of it, and that this ministry is properly represented by the more central and dominant organs of the body. But as these are *in* the body and a part of it, so the teaching ministry is a part of the spiritual body, and not on a plane above it. But he goes on.

"Neither can there be the least doubt that the general scope and spirit of this doctrine recognize in society every variety of distinction which exists between the different organs of the human body, with every variety of grade which intervenes between the head and the feet. And yet Prof. Bush appears to see nothing of the kind, and actually asserts 'that diversity of uses in the Lord's spiritual body does not necessarily create diversity of *grades* in those who perform such uses.' To this absurdity is he fairly driven by his logic, which infers that because all members of the social body are men, therefore there is no distinction between them; and would equally prove, that because the head and feet are parts of the same individual man, therefore the one is not above the other, but that they are both on precisely the same level, and the human system is as destitute of organization as a block or a stone."—Pp. 172, 173.

We should be somewhat interested to see an attempt made to misrepresent our real sentiments more effectually than is here done. From the tenor of our remarks

nothing could be more obvious than that by "diversity of *grades*," we mean that kind of *grade* which separates one class in the church from another by a discrete degree of dignity and pre-eminence. Such a grade we understand to be occupied by the clergy as contradistinguished from the laity. Such a grade we do not recognize as existing in the New Church, nor do we consider the analogy on which C. R. insists as requiring the admission of that kind of distinction. The variety of functions and uses in the natural body, we freely concede to have their analogues in the spiritual, but we are wholly at a loss to discover with which of the corporeal organs or powers the clerical caste corresponds.

As our critic proceeds in his strictures he ascribes to us the confusion which he finds in his own ideas in regard to a distinction in use which does not amount to a distinction in office. "Our own view of the case is, that the attempt which Prof. Bush has made to explain this difficulty is not a successful one; and we think, moreover, that the more it should be extended, the less successful it would be. For he very carefully leaves out of the case one essential element, and the farther the argument is pursued the greater is the confusion that ensues. This element is the religious or sacred or priestly order." That is to say, that inasmuch as we deny the priestly caste in the New Church in contradistinction from the laic, we therefore exclude that element in the church which is properly to be deemed "religious or sacred," as these epithets he makes synonymous with "priestly." How far this comes short of denying to the profane laity any thing "religious or sacred" and ascribing it wholly to the clergy perhaps other eyes may see more clearly than our own. As to the truth of the allegation as bearing upon our views, we have only to say, that if there is a "religious or sacred element" in the church or in the universe we recognize it in the function performed by the teaching ministry. Is there no possibility for a religious element to come into play in the New Church but through the medium of just such a priesthood as C. R.

contends for? But again, "He concedes something to the necessity of having teachers in the church, but he makes no concession in favor of a ministry or priesthood, or of anything strictly clerical." The reader is of course aware by this time of the true sense in which our language is to be understood, and of the genuine grounds on which our positions rest. We *do* make concession in favor of a ministry, a function of teaching, but not of a priesthood or clergy, because the ideas conveyed by these latter terms are to our apprehension entirely different. If it be not so, it behoved our opponent to show, in an argumentative way, the fallacy of the distinction; but instead of this he confronts us afresh with his quotations from the famous chapter on civil and ecclesiastical government, around which as a centre the clerical argument always swings, and to which it is apparently tethered.

"We hardly need remind our readers how different this teaching is from the teaching of Swedenborg, who says that there are two things which ought to be in order among men,—the things of heaven and the things of the world, or ecclesiastical things and civil things. That this order cannot be maintained without governors, and that governors over ecclesiastical things are called priests, and their office the priesthood. Also that dignity and honor ought to be paid to priests, on account of the *sanctity of their office*. (*H. D.* 311–318.) But, according to Prof. Bush, the sooner the seal of this sanctity is removed the better."—P. 174.

Here, as usual, a special turn or twist is given to our words, making them to utter as offensive a sentiment as possible. Our language is as follows:—"But here we can easily foresee that the claims of order will be urged. Is it not opening the door to confusion and every evil work to concede such license on the score of preaching or teaching? Will it not be a grievous infraction of order and a serious perilling of the best interests of the Church if the seal of sanctity be taken off from the clerical office, and the current distinction between clergy and laity virtually done away?" The *sanctity* of which we speak is the sanctity attaching in the estimation of the Christian world to an order of men called the *clergy*

*or priesthood*, which we deny to exist in the New Church. All that we should say is, that that peculiar form of sanctity which has been supposed to pertain to the clergy of the Christian Church is not mentally carried over to the true ministry of the New Church, which is constructed after an entirely different model. To this also as being the Lord's ordinance we believe a genuine sanctity belongs, from which we would not derogate in the least. Yet C. R. asserts that "the teachers which our theory contemplates are not properly ministers; for their office, if indeed any official station is really left them, is entirely divested of all idea of sanctity." Why so? If they are of divine appointment, or in accordance with divine order, why should they not have all requisite sanctity? Every thing has its sanctity according to the degree and quality of its use, and the measure of the divine influx into it. What motive could we have for impairing the reverence for this kind of sanctity? As to the citation from Swedenborg, which our critic would fain offset against us, we perceive in it no special appropriateness to the present case, as we, like him, are disposed to let the Old Church remain in possession of all the sanctity that its votaries may think fit to ascribe to it, only we object to predicating the same kind of sanctity of the teachers of the New Church, because we do not look upon them as constituting the same order. As to Swedenborg himself, he would naturally in this relation speak of the *sanctity* of the priestly office, because speaking of what was reputed holy in the existing order of things in the world.

The same remark applies to the extracts from the "Doctrine of Charity," which evidently inculcate the exercise of that principle in the various relations of life, as society is at present constituted. For this reason it prescribes, among other things, the duties incumbent upon soldiers and generals. Can such a state of things exist in the New Jerusalem? Will wars and fightings find place under that dispensation of love and peace? Not but that the men of that dispensation, in its earlier



stages, may be brought into contact with the "horrid trade" of arms, but can its genius harmonize with the spirit of carnage and conquest? Can the institutions of war spring up as a natural growth under the benignant and heavenly auspices of the New Jerusalem? It is obvious then that Swedenborg prescribes the duties of charity in a reference to a state of things which will pass away as the Holy City descends more and more fully into the minds of men. On this ground we interpret all such passages as those so often quoted in defence of clerical prerogative. They are dicta not strictly predicable of the New Church, but of the Old. This construction will doubtless be regarded as the crown of all our heresies—an imputation to which we shall submit with the best grace we can command.

We had said, in the course of our Remarks, that among the contrasted characteristics of the Old and the New Church was this, that in the Old Church the individual man was held in abeyance, while in the New he was brought forward and elevated—that freedom and rationality were especially his prerogatives, the exercise of which he was never to wave—that each individual must see truth for himself and order his life according to it. In this we had reference to what Swedenborg more than once says relative to the mass of men in Christendom, that they are prone to take up their religious sentiments from tradition and education, thinking blindly with the multitude, and making it merely a thing of the memory, whereas, the very genius of the New Church requires that every man should have a clear and rational perception of truth for himself and order his life accordingly. But upon this score our article is again taken seriously to task.

"Now we know of no authority whatever for the distinction here stated, in regard to the individual man being kept in abeyance in the Old Church, and elevated in the New. Indeed, if there is any difference of the kind to be taken account of, it seems to us clearly to be the opposite of what is here declared. For freedom and rationality are the essential elements of man in all churches, and it was equally

necessary in the Old Church as in the New, that every one should see truth for himself, and order his life according to it. There is given to the New Church, a higher degree of freedom and rationality than was enjoyed by the Old. But this has no tendency to bring forward and elevate the individual, as compared with the social man. For the freedom and rationality of the New Church is the freedom and rationality of heaven, as its doctrines are the doctrines of heaven. And if we contemplate for a moment the state of a heavenly society in this respect, we shall see that the perfection of the individual does not consist in his being elevated as an individual, or apart from the society of which he is a member, but in the closeness of his union with the other members. As the society becomes more and more perfect, which is effected by the addition of new members, who come into their respective places, as it were in the interstices of the body not yet filled out, there is no tendency to make themselves or others more prominent as individuals, but to cause all to be more united as one man."—P. 175.

Here the whole force of the reasoning rests upon the assumption that the more full and perfect development of the individual man is inconsistent with his relation to the integrity of the social man as formed after the model of the heavenly societies. In this respect he has not the happiness to agree with Swedenborg, who, after saying that "a one does not exist without a form, but that the form itself makes a one," goes on to remark:—

*"That the form makes a one so much the more perfectly in proportion as the things which enter into it are distinct from each other, and nevertheless united. This is comprehended with difficulty unless the understanding be elevated, because there is an appearance that form cannot make a one except when there is a similarity in the things which constitute it. On this subject I have frequently conversed with the angels, who said that this is an arcanum, which the wise among them could perceive clearly, but the less wise obscurely: that nevertheless it is a truth, that a form is so much the more perfect in proportion as the things which constitute it are distinct from each other, but still united in a particular manner. They confirmed this by reference to the societies in the heavens, which, taken together, constitute the form of heaven; and to the angels of each society, of which it may be affirmed that, the more every individual has a distinct identity of character, in which he freely acts, and thus loves his associates from himself or from his own affection, the more perfect is the form of the society. They also illustrated it by the marriage of goodness and truth, which, the more distinctly they are two, can more perfectly form a one; and, in like manner, by love and wisdom; showing that what is indis-*

tinget is confused, whence results all imperfection of form."—*Divine Providence*, n. 4, 5.

Of course our reviewer will *say* that he does not question this in the least; that it is precisely his own view of the matter, and that he objects to our view because it does not harmonize with this. But wherein? Why are we represented as going counter to great principles taught in the New Church, when the points of contrariety are not distinctly shown? To this he has nothing to reply, but that "the perfection of the individual does not consist in his being elevated as an individual, or *apart from the society in which he is a member*, but in the closeness of his union with the other members." So also in the succeeding paragraph, after affirming that there is one particular part in the society which every member fills alone and exclusively, he adds, "this is far from making him prominent, or bringing him forward as an individual, or *causing him to be independent of others*." Here are conditions annexed which our positions know nothing of, and for which, of course, they are not responsible. We have advanced no theory of individualism which conflicts with the closest relation to the collective man. On the principle above quoted from Swedenborg, that the perfection of the whole depends upon the degree of distinctness with which the parts pronounce themselves, the two things are perfectly consistent with each other. Our friend has therefore launched out into a train of discourse very sound and edifying in itself, but very far from having any special relation to aught that we have affirmed in our remarks.

G. B.

# NEW CHURCH ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT.

BY REV. A. E. FORD.

[N. C. Repos., July, 1850.]

It is designed, in the present number, to advocate a General Convention, and to advocate it from the proper constitution of the ministry. But, as the rightful *existence* of the ministry as a class distinct from the laity has been called in question, this point must first engage our attention. It is a wearisome task to be laying foundations over again, but when that which has been settled, both in the first Christian Church and the New Church of the Lord, is treated as the error of ages, we have no choice left us. (a)

A ministry distinct from the laity is plainly to be read in the New Testament ; it existed in the times immediately succeeding the Apostolic age, and was almost universal through every period of the first Christian Church to its close. (b) It is plain that the Lord during His life in the world brought the Apostles into a peculiar relation with Himself, one whereby they were prepared to become teachers of Christian doctrine,—that He commissioned them, at his ascension, to preach and baptize—that, after His ascension, they actually fulfilled this office—that they exercised the power of ordering the external affairs of the Churches—that, among other things, they appointed “ Presbyters ” who were a teaching class — and that “ Deacons ” are mentioned in the Epistles in a way strongly favoring the idea that they had the same function with presbyters in a subordinate degree. That Polycarp, the disciple of John, was the “ Bishop ” of Smyrna, that Clemens (probably the companion of Paul) was the “ Bishop ” of Rome, and that Irenæus was the “ Bishop ” of Lyons, are among the undisputed facts of ecclesiastical history—and whatever sense may be attributed to the word “ Bishop,” it bore, undeniably, at that period, the sense of a permanent functionary in teaching and administering the things of public worship. That there was a clergy, distinct from the laity, in three orders, called bishops, priests, and deacons, is as certain, in the year 1850, as that there is a clergy, consisting of these grades, with the superaddition of Archbishops, Cardinals, and a Pope, in the Roman Catholic Church of the present day. Now, even setting aside the Scriptural part of this argument, the position which Eusebius has taken, and in which the esteemed Editor of the Repository has joined him, has against it the heavy presumption, that a thing so enormous (in their account) as the distinction of clergy and laity should have originated in very contact with the Apostles. The universal consent of the first Christian Church also lies against it—and if it should be

alleged, that that Church, its great abuses in the matter considered, is but a poor commentary on the principle contended for, it is to be remembered that the abolition of the clerical order has a yet more discreditable patronage, it having found favor only with some of the enthusiastic sects of that church—its very worst portions.(c)

With this passing notice of the Scriptural argument confirmed by ecclesiastical history, let us turn our attention to some of the respective grounds on which the distinction between the clergy and the laity may be made to rest.

It rests on *use* as its true, and indeed, sacred foundation. If we look at the very nature of a Christian Church, we shall perceive, that it implies instruction.(d) Men are gathered together into a church, in order that in it and through it, as an instrument, they may be prepared for heaven. This preparation is to be made, in the first instance, by acquiring truths, and then by living according to them. We cannot have these truths by intuition, like the men of the most ancient Church. Nor by revelation, like the men of other earths in the universe. It remains, therefore, that we learn them by the external way. This learning, in accordance with the law of the Divine Providence, that men must be ministers of use to one another, demands a *medium* of instruction—and, in accordance with another of its laws, the law that we must be led by delights—this instruction will fall into the hands of those who have a love for it in the will, a capacity for it in the intellect, and qualifications for it by study. Thus far, it may be said that there is no dispute between the two sides of the present question, those who advocate a perfect spontaneity in the things of the clerical function not supposing that *all* would avail themselves of their inherent right to be priests. It will be well, therefore, to turn to points on which there is a diversity of views. Three of these may be noticed.

1. The first is, *authorized introduction into the ministry as contradistinguished from self-introduction*. Shall the ministerial function be something left in the midst, as it were, and open to every one who chooses to occupy it? May every one, making himself the judge of his own qualifications, say: "I feel myself called to this use: I have an inherent right to it. I admit no power on earth to abridge me in the exercise of this right," and thereupon proceed to preach and administer the sacraments. It seems to some that, if this question is settled in the affirmative in the church, an admirable state of things, as regards liberty, will result, and that usurpation and dissension will have their very roots pulled up among us. But cool reason has its doubts on this matter. If the gates of the ministry are thus thrown open to all, with no guard at them on the part of the general Church, it is morally certain that many will enter who will be defective in capacity, in learning, and in civil and moral character.(e) The clerical function will be taken up from evil as well as good delight; it will be used as the mere means of livelihood—as a make-shift, while the occupant prepares for the medical or some other profession; it will be a kind of sewer to catch those whom school-teaching, and mercantile life, and

the legal profession, have purged out of their ranks. But let us look only at the effect of this arrangement on the intelligence of the ministry. The majority of its members, it will be safe to say, will be without skill in the original tongues in which the Word is written, and without the general cultivation which is essential to respectability. They will be making constant mistakes, which the more intelligent of their hearers can see through, and exposing ignorance at which the more light-minded among them will laugh. The consequences will be unhappy, for *respect* is an element in the feeling with which a teacher must be regarded, no matter what his subject, if he is to teach with effect. We have examples of both, a learned and an unlearned ministry, before our eyes, of religious bodies where the teachers and the taught pride themselves upon their scorn of intellectual preparation for the ministry, and of others in which learning is prized and cultivated. We can make ourselves, in point of respectability, like the one or the other, at our option, and we shall be making our choice, in deciding whether we will recognize any one who comes to us offering to take charge of our spiritual instruction, on the simple ground that he feels an impulse so to do, or whether we will require of him, besides, that the Church, as well as himself, shall have judged of his fitness, and stamped his vocation with her impress.(f)

The other side replies to this argument, of course, that each congregation, or society, can best judge of what, in a minister, suits it. This is true; but societies can use this right either in a selfish manner, or, looking to the general good. A society cannot "live to itself," any more than a man; all its actions, usages, and measures go abroad in effects on the general church. If it recognizes an unfit man as a minister, it so far discredits the ministry in general, compromises the respectability of the New Church, obliges neighboring societies to put up with his lack of capacity, vulgarity, or immorality, if these are his traits, or else, at the risk of exciting bad feeling, to refuse his services. It is for this, among other reasons, that societies should combine together and determine by rule, what qualifications are desirable for entrance into the ministry in general, while they reserve to themselves the right of selecting, from this general body, those adapted for themselves in particular. Such a step, if it involves any sacrifice of *rights* on the part of societies, would be a sacrifice from a noble motive. Who shall forbid this pervading of mutual regard? The opposite argument steps in and *binds* societies to selfishness, bidding them look at their minister, each, as one in whom it alone is interested, when, in fact, the ministry is a public office, and the peace and respectability of the church at large is involved by every one of their recognitions. Moreover, as regards this matter of recognition, no society can get along with recognizing *only* the minister or ministers that officiate to it. The indispersable commerce of societies among themselves requires that they recognize *one another's* ministers. Shall this recognition or non-recognition of other ministers be made by special acts, or by a general arrangement among themselves? Manifestly the latter is the preferable way.(g)

A remark about this whole matter of deducing ecclesiastical order from the *rights* of societies will be in place here. It is a selfish spirit that is thus inculcated upon societies. Swedenborg, somewhere in the Spiritual Diary, has made the observation that jurists have erred in deducing the maxims of municipal and international law from the rights of the parties, and that they should have drawn them from mutual charity. This observation, so striking in its first application, is equally so as regards the mutual intercourse of societies.

2. The second point of difference will be *the ordination of the clergy by the clergy*. One looks in vain over the articles of Eusebius and the remarks of the Editor for an allowance of ordination. It lays in their very path, but they have got by it without notice. One is compelled to feel that, if they recognize it at all, it is with a most suspicious and backward acknowledgment. However this may be, of ordination *by the clergy* there is the following plain rejection: "By the distinct order or office of the clergy in the church, we mean an order *which perpetuates itself* by some special form of ordination or inauguration, wherein the body of the church or the laity, as they are termed, have no share." That such an order of men, whether called priests, clergymen, or ministers, was designed to exist in the New Church is what we venture to deny. That to the contrary of this, ordination, by *some* hands, is to be used in the New Church, we have the explicit authority of Swedenborg. Canons of N. C. iv. 7: "That the clergy, because they are to teach doctrine from the Word concerning the Lord, and concerning redemption and salvation from Him, are to be inaugurated by the covenant (or promise, *sponseonem*) of the Holy Spirit *and by their representation of its translation*; but that it is received by the clergy according to the faith of their life." Now, shall the right thus explicitly recognized by Swedenborg be administered by the clergy, that is, by those who have already been inaugurated, or by those who have not? (*h*) All congruity and propriety say, by the former. It would be a strange spectacle, at an inauguration, that those inaugurated for the very purpose of conducting public religious services, should be bid to stand aside, while some one uninaugurated, unused to the work, and probably unskillful in it, should read the necessary services, make the prayers, and perform the representative of translation. The only reason pleaded for this indecorum in one point of view, and in another, this violation of the very principle of ordination by giving a function allied to teaching to the uninaugurated, is, that certain false doctrines have been associated with this rite in the Old Church. But this reason becomes of no weight, the moment it is known that these doctrines are held in abhorrence, not more by the laity than by the clergy, among us. (*h*)

But if the clergy ordain the clergy, does this make them a "self-perpetuating order?" To a certain extent it would, perhaps, if they should *assume* this authority; but, if it is *conferred* upon them, by the rules of the Church, which, as has been shown, have their origin with the laity, then any one can see that it does not. Neither are they a self-perpe-

tuating order," unless, besides the power of ordaining, they have the power of *appointing* themselves—but, in this essential article, which is well distinguished in Mr. Prescott's letter from ordination, they are now associated with the laity—and no one wishes it to be otherwise.(i)

3. The third point of difference will lie in the position, that *the functions of teaching publicly and administering the Sacraments should be appropriated to the clergy.*(j) My friendly opponents would have these functions free to all, without ordination. One of them says: "It is not unusual to hear it said, that persons not duly inducted should not be allowed to officiate in the ministry. But who is authorized to prevent them, and whence came the power?" But, that certain functions should be restricted to the clergy, is plain from the nature of ordination.(k) It is originally an inauguration, that is, a badge of entrance—sometimes into a society, sometimes into a college (then called matriculation), sometimes into an office in the state—and, in every case, the entrance is into something *peculiar* and *appropriated*, not into something that was open to the person entering before the ceremony, and which he is to hold in common with all who are without this badge afterwards. Ordination would be the merest nullity, regarded as an inauguration, if the recipient *might* have officiated without it himself, and all others can enter into his functions without it also. Would such an empty trifle be recognized among the canons of the New Church? Inauguration is entrance into something segregated or secluded; but this would be entrance, so to speak, into all "out o' doors."(l)

The point argued for is plain, also, from the nature of the *office*—a term which Swedenborg applies to the priesthood. We can *imagine* a state of the Church in which clerical functions should be exercised indiscriminately by all, and there would be no difficulty in showing, in the words of the Editor, that, in this case, there would be "a distinction in use which does not amount to a distinction in office, or rather in official order and caste." But he is really called upon to show that, when the clerical functions have been segregated, as it were, and constituted into an "office," that office, and consequently they who fill it, are not set apart by limits. There would be no "office" of the Priesthood, in the state of things advocated by Eusebius, any more than in a community, where every man acted, as occasion called, as arbiter in disputes, there would be "the office" of a Judge. No office exists until functions, that were before in common, are gathered up and limited to a certain individual or class. Now he who fills the office of the priesthood is a clerical *officer*, as he who fills an office in the administration of justice, is a judicial officer—and this fact as much implies, that, for reasons of public utility, his functions shall not lie open to the first occupant who chooses to make himself such, as that those of the Judge should not. If this parallel is denied, it must be shown that what is manifestly a law of divine order, in civil government, is a law of tyranny in ecclesiastical government.

As regards "the authority to prevent" all from acting as ministers indiscriminately, which is demanded in the extract given above, it lies



in the right of every society to recognize its religious teachers (which, of course, involves the right to refuse recognition to the unfit), which is contended for on the other side. It is this very right, exercised by societies in combination.(m) By what authority, it might be asked, imitating the question above quoted, shall any one say to societies : "You may accept or refuse whom you please for your religious teachers, provided you act separately, but you shall not combine into a body, and prescribe, in the body you then form, whom you will and will not accept."(n)

The above arguments for appropriating the functions of the Ministry to the clerical order are confirmed by Swedenborg. How could the point under consideration, so far as teaching is concerned, be asserted more luminously than in the words which follow :—"Good may be insinuated into another by every one in the country, but not truth, except by those who are teaching ministers. If others insinuate truth, it gives birth to heresies, and the Church is disturbed and rent asunder."—A. C. 6822.(o)

That the same is true of the sacraments appears from the Canons, C. 4, 8, 9,—“That the Divine (Proceeding), which is understood by the Holy Spirit, proceeds from the Lord through the clergy to the laity, by preachings, according to the reception of the doctrine of truth thence derived. And also by the sacrament of the Holy Supper according to repentance before receiving it.” The heading up of the whole chapter is as follows : “That hence [the Divine proceeding passes] through men to men, and, in the Church, chiefly from the clergy to the laity.”(p)

To these arguments for the clergy as a distinct class might be added one from the innumerable collisions and irregularities by which the Church, if it were so unwise as to make the experiment urged upon it, would be “taught as with thorns” that law is not tyranny, nor the unbounded liberty of individuals, freedom. Such confusions can be easily foreseen, and while the fear of them is upon us, we cannot feel re-assured by such assertions, as those contained in the following words : “As to heretical or incompetent ministers, and the proper mode of dealing with them, this, in an orderly state of the Church, will take care of itself.” There are remarkable analogies between the “no human priesthood,” sentiments and the “no human government” ones. The assertion of both, that no disorders will result from the attempt to realize theories, is very confident, but very destitute of rational guarantees.(q)

The above positions might be supported by more numerous citations from the writings of the Church ; but space does not admit of this, and scarcely of the single observation which we will here subjoin, with regard to the construction of such passages. There are two ways of dealing with them. In the first, we collect them together and submit them to the view of the mind, not only *singly*, but as a *whole*, which they make by combining together. We suffer one to cast light on another. We suffer them to develope and support each other mutually, and then gather the import of each passage according to the general sense of the

whole. In the second way, we take each passage singly, and apply to it an ingenious criticism by which its more obvious meaning is made doubtful, and then judge the meaning of the whole to be the sum of the senses yielded by this isolating process. When we gather into one view all that Swedenborg has said on the necessity of "government in the Church" as well as in the State, that there must be "governors" in it who are "priests"—what he has said respecting "the clergy and the laity," manifestly distinguishing them, and showing what the former must do and not do—respecting their "inauguration"—respecting the danger of heresy when others are allowed to teach—respecting the "honor and dignity" which are to be shown them, and the principles on which they may accept them—and respecting the Trine in which they are to be constituted—and then contemplate such opinions as are drawn from these passages by Eusebius, supported by the Editor; we cannot help feeling, that, with the most heartfelt reverence for Swedenborg's instructions in higher matters, they are, in these minor ones, by the isolating process above described, unconsciously engaged in contradicting their teacher, while they seem to themselves only construing him in a sound sense.(r)

The grounds on which that sense of these passages which would strike most as the fair one is eliminated, and another one put in its place, are three—which will now be noticed in succession.

1. Ecclesiastical domination. The adverse argument everywhere goes on the supposition, that the love of dominion produced the distinction between clergy and laity, and the ordination of the clergy by the clergy. It even asserts one of these to be "the *proton pseudos*, the fundamental falsity" of the love of dominion. But the assertion is not true, historically; the clergy as a distinct body, dates itself far back of the rise of that spirit in the Church.(s) These external institutions and forms became hurtful only when the *doctrine of the keys*, that of absolution, and that of the apostolic succession were added to them. These doctrines were as a hand put forth by the love of dominion, by which it seized upon a legitimate and useful implement, and turned it to most mischievous uses.(t) Do away with those doctrines—(and surely my friendly opponents will allow that they are held in abhorrence among us)—and the separate existence of the clergy will be like an axe taken from the grasp of a madman, and given to a workman in his right senses, who immediately employs it in building a house. Is it not a *little* external—to indulge in a friendly retort—to be attributing to the merest externals the desolations of the Babylonish spirit? Had it not been for the doctrines above mentioned, the external constitution of the Roman Church (which, after all, is a perversion of the original form of the ministry) would have been only a *highly inexpedient* form of Church government; it would have embarrassed charity and faith, but could never have changed them into their opposites.(u)

2. The individual man is a Church. Strange that the general principle relied upon for calling Swedenborg's *special* statements into doubt (*Rep.* p. 227) should give them a decided support. Carry out

the analogy correctly, and this will be apparent. The man is composed of goods and truths, two perfectly distinct things; priests correspond, in the collective church, with goods, and the laity consequently with truths, and as goods and truths are distinct, the clergy and laity must be distinct also. If every man in the collective church were a priest, then the individual man could consist of nothing but goods.(v) On the subject of every man being a priest, the following passage from the Diary, No. 4904, has a bearing: "There were also certain ones [falling from heaven] who rejected the priestly function—saying that the priesthood was universal, thus with all." This passage which will be found (with remarks by the Editor) in a former number of the Repository, is reproduced here for the purpose of remarking, that, by obvious implication, "rejecting the priestly function" (or office) is the equivalent of "saying that the priesthood is universal, and with all." In the general can any one believe that Swedenborg would mention, in this way, an important particular of New Church order, as the priesthood of all is asserted by the other side to be.(w)

3. Societies are prior to the ministry and establish it. "The ministry of a society antedates that of an order of the clergy pertaining to the Church at large." This argument proves something only by confounding the *forming* stage of the Church as to government, with its *mature* stage. All things that grow have these two stages, and the order of operation in the last is very different from that which obtains in the first. Take for example the earth; its first state is that of the mineral kingdom, which kingdom at first receives influx immediately through heaven; but when the two superior kingdoms are formed, with man at their head, the influx into that kingdom is thenceforth through them. So with the mind of man itself, the influx of good is, at first, into the affection of sciences in the external, whereby the rational is formed, but afterwards, so far as the rational is formed, good flows into the affection of sciences through it. It is matter of necessity that the *first* ordination should be by the laity, but it is vain to rely upon this as proof that it should be so *always*. If our country had been settled and organized by counties, and counties had afterwards combined into states, and states into the federal union, would it be thought a valid argument for taking away from the President and the Senate the appointment of certain officers, that officers were at first appointed by counties? You cannot govern a *man* by the laws of *embryo* life, and you should not make the church, *full-grown*, conform to the model of its *forming* stage.(x)

If, by what goes before, it has been sufficiently shown that the clerical functions are dictated by use—that none should enter upon them self-inducted—nor without ordination by those personally inaugurated to the same, and that they should be appropriated to the clergy for reasons of public order, it is plain that the clergy and the laity ought to form distinct classes in the New Church.

## REMARKS

It is with some reluctance that we extend the space devoted to the preceding article by any subjoined remarks of our own. But as we have some strictures to offer upon the positions of A. E. F., and as they would lose much of their effect by being presented separate from the matter which occasions them, we embrace the present opportunity to put in our rejoinder. We are conscious of doing this at a great disadvantage from being obliged to restrict ourselves on several points to a few sentences, when whole pages would scarcely suffice to do justice to our views.

(a) It is doubtless a wearisome task to be laying foundations over again which will not *stay laid*, and such will necessarily be the case with every foundation laid by man and not by the Lord himself. It is easy to say that such and such things have been "settled," and "set upon their own base," when a stricter inquisition may show that they have been built upon the shifting sand-banks of falsity instead of the immovable rock of truth. The mere fact that a particular institution of the church has long held its place unquestioned is no infallible sign that it rests upon a solid basis. It is quite possible that it may be among the old things which are to be disallowed and pass away before the genius of the New Dispensation. In this case it will be in vain to say "The bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewn stones; the sycamore trees are hewn down, but we will change them into cedars." Foundations of all sorts are the very things which New Church principles most sternly interrogate.

(b) The evidence on this head drawn from the New Testament and from the writings of the Fathers, is, in our view, of very conflicting character, and of very unequal authority. In the mind of a Newchurchman it is of very little consequence to the argument that the distinction between clergy and laity "existed in the times

immediately succeeding the apostolic age." The leaven of Antichrist began to work even in the life-time of the apostles, and it is not at all wonderful that the clergy, following in the wake of Diotrephes, should have begun to erect themselves into a separate caste at the early period alluded to. The love of pre-eminence easily grafts itself upon the function of teaching, and the history of the first Christian church from the outset is a running commentary upon the truth of the intimation. The advocates of church power and clerical prerogative are very prone to rest the argument rather on the patristic than the scriptural basis, and the words of Ignatius, Clemens, Tertullian, and the rest are, on the Episcopal theory, for instance, all gold and precious stones, while on the New Church theory they are hay and stubble, dirt and trash. It is the Word of the Lord only and its illumined exposition that determine for us every thing pertaining to the Church, and we have for ourselves sought unto these oracles in vain to find an adequate warrant for the past and present order of things ecclesiastic which has prevailed throughout the Christian world. But upon this head we cannot now enlarge. We are prepared, however, to discuss the Scriptural argument whenever it shall be fairly called for.

(c) We could hardly have anticipated that an argument, from a New Church pen, in behalf of the distinction between clergy and laity, should have been so constructed as to recognize as well founded, the trinal array of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. If such an argument is valid against the denial of the existence of the clergy as a distinct class, why is it not valid in support of such a gradation as an actual feature of the New Church? We do not see but that according to A. E. F. the same Scriptural proof which establishes the fact of the distinction, establishes also the duty of its observance; or, in other words, that the Church is recreant to its Lord if it do not arrange its ministry according to the Episcopal model. In this case we shall content ourselves by turning over our correspondent to the Presbyterians and Indepen-

dents who have on this head so successfully entered the lists with the Papists and Prelatists. It is a controversy with which the Newchurchman has nothing to do but to stand aloof from it. "That there was a clergy distinct from the laity, in three orders, called bishops, priests, and deacons, is as certain in the year 150, as that there is a clergy consisting of these grades, with the superaddition of Archbishops, Cardinals, and a Pope, in the Roman Catholic Church of the present day." Doubtless; and the authority for the one is just as good as that for the other; which is saying as little for either as can well be said.

(d) We have expressly declared that we recognize a function of teaching in the New Church. This function rests of course on a foundation of *use*. But what we maintain is, that the discharge of the function does not necessitate the creation of a distinct order or caste in the Church, exclusively and pre-eminently set apart to it, and forming, as it were, a separate plane above that of the laity. The ability to teach in spiritual things depends upon the degree of illumination in the teacher, and this again upon the degree to which he is in good and truth. But the being in good and truth is not the prerogative of any one portion of the men of the church, but the duty of all. It is what all are to aim at, and yet as there will always be a diversity of attainment in this respect, so the function will distribute itself accordingly. The same member who is a teacher to others whose spiritual state is below his, may be at the same time a pupil to others whose spiritual state is above his. The gifts of all, however, are in some way put in requisition. Every one is to edify another as occasion may offer, yet not in a spirit of arrogance or dictation, but in a spirit of humility and self-subjection. The evil heretofore existing has arisen from erecting an occasional function into a permanent office, and appropriating the performance of its duties to an exclusive and privileged class. Subtle arguments are never wanting for such a process, as one party does not object to being excused from onerous duties, and

the other has an innate latent love of dominion to be gratified. Between both the present order of things has been begotten and obtained establishment in the church. It is doubtless a perverted order, from which there will eventually be a recession, but we do not advocate its instant abandonment. We are willing to await the result of a gradual change, provided a change shall be actually intended, and it is no more than justice to our sentiments that they should not be charged as so essentially radical and revolutionary in their nature as to demand sudden and violent reforms. On this head it is probable we shall be greatly misapprehended and misrepresented, but as we know ourselves in the matter, we shall abide the issues with calmness. It is not *necessary* that wrong impressions should be taken up in regard to our true position.

(e) A case is here supposed which amounts to well-nigh a complete caricature of the state of things for which we are contending. No better evidence of a man's utter unfitness for the function in question could be afforded than the spirit which expresses itself in the language above put into the lips of a self-sufficient aspirant to ministry in the Church. No rightly disposed servant of the Lord can enter upon any sphere of use in a spirit of arrogant assumption or with a tone of lofty defiance. The true minister, as the name imports, is one who would fain be the servant of all, and this is a spirit of modesty and self-distrust, prompting one to withhold rather than protrude his claims to consideration and deference. As to the danger that may hence accrue to the church, from a non-authorized or self-authorized introduction into the ministry, we have only to say that on the true theory, as we apprehend it, of church order, there will be little to be feared on this score, inasmuch as every society will select its own teachers, upon adequate probation, and as the function is unfeud, its labor being purely a labor of love, small indeed will be the inducement for any one to resort to it from any selfish or mercenary motive. On the score of detriment to the church from the probable intrusion of

*unlearned* men as teachers, we may admit the force of the objection provided the culture of the *intellect* is to be regarded as the paramount object of the Christian ministry. But it would seem that a simple reference to the first principles of the New Church would be sufficient to correct a fallacy like this. If all wisdom is the form of love, and all truth the product of good, the grand desideratum is the purification of the will and its affections. All desirable mental enlightenment will follow in the train of a regenerated love. *Ubi charitas, ibi claritas*. The influence necessary to effect this is not that of human learning. The revelations vouchsafed to the New Church teach new lessons respecting the comparative value of the attainments of the head and of the heart, and leave us in no doubt that the great work of the ministry is to lead to the good of life by a pathway continually illuminated by the light of the genuine doctrines of the Word. Human learning, as furnishing ampler vessels for the inflow of divine truth and good, is never to be disparaged, but we would fain fortify our own minds against the idea that the true standard of ministerial qualification is a knowledge of the original languages of Scripture or rare acquisitions in science, letters, or art. The kind of ability to unfold the spiritual sense of the Word, which results from the illustration usually granted to a pure and exemplary life, is of incomparably more use in the ministry than the most signal mastery of the learned tongues. Moderate talents and attainments, coupled with good sense and an enlightened zeal, are usually the best guarantee for usefulness in the service of the Lord's New Church.

(*f*) The surest way for the New Church to attain the *respectability* which our correspondent covets for her, is to live up to and act fully out her distinguishing principles. These are principles of life, and such as make their appeal to every individual of the church; and if the mass of receivers honor the truths they possess, the church will inevitably be respectable and respected, and her teachers, as a general fact, equally so. "Like people, like priest."



(g) Every step in a discussion like the present shows how difficult it is to divest the mind of its old conceptions. The strictures of A. E. F. recognize all along just such a state of things ecclesiastically as now exists as a field of clerical action. Each society has one minister or pastor, and as he is inducted into the sacred office by the consecrating act of his clerical brethren, he thereby obtains the seal of their sanction and an *entree*, in consequence, into the various pulpits in the connexion. In this sense the office is held to be a *public* one, which renders the occupancy of it by fit incumbents a matter of great concern to the general body of the Church. But how is it in the order for which we plead? There every society has a plurality of teachers according to its exigencies, and according to the diversity of gifts possessed by its members. The society in Boston, for instance, may serve as an example. We have there listened to lectures of eminent ability and use delivered from time to time by highly intelligent laymen, who were every way qualified for the work, and to whom the society evidently gave heed with great delight. We know of nothing that should prevent a New Church Society from regarding a number of such men as its true ministry, who need nothing more than the acknowledgment of the members to authorize them for the due discharge of all the functions of spiritual teachers and guides. And if acknowledged in this capacity by one society, why should they not be by another, should they perchance visit or sojourn for a time among them? They are men in good repute, qualified to impart instruction or to kindle affection, and prompted by a love of use. Is there any reason why they should not sustain abroad the same character they do at home? Yet they would not covet or claim the title of *clergymen* on this account, for they do not, by exercising this function, constitute a distinct order or Brahminical caste in the Church. They are plain citizens, gaining their livelihood by their several secular vocations in life, and giving themselves, as occasion may serve, to the spiritual benefit of their brethren, because

actuated by the love of the neighbor in one of its purest forms. On the whole we do not perceive that the above objection is a valid one; we do not acknowledge that the interests of the church at large are any more promoted or protected by the existing arrangements than by those proposed. Indeed, the advantage, if anything, is on the side of the latter as it is supposed that none will be called to the exercise of the teaching function but those who have been tried and approved in that department, whereas, in the present order, persons are introduced into the ministry without any previous preparation, other than scholastic, and the various societies are expected to recognize them on the ground of the approbation of their ordainers.

(b) Denying, as we do, the legitimate existence in the New Church of the clergy as a permanently distinct class of men, it were scarcely to be expected that we should have much to say of the distinguishing rite which has been regarded as constituting them as such. But we have no quarrel with ordination *as such*; it is with its asserted instrumentality in creating a superior order in the Church that we are at variance. It is, therefore, by a misapprehension of our meaning that we are charged with "plainly rejecting ordination by the clergy." What we reject is the *clergy ordained* as a separate class, and not the *ordination itself*, except as the basis on which the clerical character rests. We are obviously arguing here against a *self-perpetuating* order of men, distinct from the laity. Viewed in this relation we of course deny to ordination the virtue usually ascribed to it as producing such an effect, but we do not thereby necessarily repudiate the rite altogether. To disallow it under one aspect is not inconsistent with allowing it under another. Rightly understood and rightly applied it may have a very intelligible use in the New Dispensation. If a society shall deem it proper to signify their acceptance of the labors of their teachers by such a ceremony, very well; we would not object to it, though we do not perceive it to be indispensable. But our objec-

tions lie mainly against the interpretations put upon the rite in its relation to a permanent and distinct class. To charge, therefore, that we reject ordination *by the clergy*, is very little to the point so long as the main question is in regard to the very existence of the order of the clergy *as A. E. F. understands it*. But upon this point we have little hope that our true position will be justly apprehended. The proposition that there may be a distinct use of teaching and of spiritual leadership in the church, without, at the same time, its constituting a distinct and self-perpetuating order termed the clergy in contradistinction from the laity, is one so complex from its very simplicity, that it will find an exceedingly difficult admission into minds pre-occupied with a different idea. Consequently we shall deem ourselves fortunate if we are not represented as denying the *use* as well as the separate office of all ministry in the Church. If so, so be it; we would define our position more clearly if we could. Our correspondent begins by giving prominence to our alleged rejection of *ordination of the clergy by the clergy*, which in our argument comes into question solely as a rite by which a distinct order of men *perpetuates itself*. It is in this relation, or as having this bearing, that we reject it. We do this on the ground that the means cannot be legitimate to an end which is illegitimate. Ordination, we hold, is not legitimate *as a means of giving perpetuity to the clerical order*. In this relation solely do we speak of it in a tone of disapproval. But from this fact it cannot be fairly inferred that we reject it in all other relations. That which is not good for one thing may be good for another; and so with ordination. The strictures of A. E. F. on this head, as they proceed, gradually shift the point and direct themselves at last against an imaginary position, as if we rejected ordination altogether because we reject it under one particular aspect. Accordingly he wheels round upon us the heavy ordinance of the extract given above, the discovery of which in 1830 among the unpublished papers of Swedenborg caused so much exultation among

the brethren of the English Conference who then had the subject of the trine in the ministry under review. And what does it prove? Simply that our author, in his day, recognized the existence of a church and a clergy among whom the communication of the Holy Spirit was signified by the imposition of hands. From a somewhat close and protracted examination in reference to this point we are satisfied that numerous passages in the writings of Swedenborg, in which mention is made of the clergy and the priesthood, refer in reality, not to the New Church, but to the old. Thus in *H. D.* of *N. J.*, 315, "With respect to priests, their duty is to teach men the way to heaven, and likewise to lead them therein. They are to teach them according to the doctrine of *their church* (*sux ecclesiæ*), which is derived from the Word of God." In the English edition of 1841 of the *H. D.* from which we quote, the reading is "according to the doctrine of *the Church*." This, we trust, is a typographical error, as it is plainly contrary to the original. Whether the American edition contains the same reading we cannot say, not having a copy at hand. We can understand this only as interpreted in conformity with the view now expressed. The spiritual teachers whom he calls *priests*, in the several departments of the Christian Church, such as the Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, &c., are to inculcate the doctrines of their respective creeds, which they all of course regard as drawn from the inspired Word and accordant with it, and to which they are faithfully to adhere in imparting instruction. In the Divine Providence of the Lord, civil and ecclesiastical government are both made to act an important part in that system of influences and agencies by which the world is kept in order. The object of the chapter is not, we conceive, to lay down a formal rule of regimen for the church, *but to show in what light its members are to regard the existing order of things in the two great departments of Church and State.* This order, as occurring under the economy of Divine Providence, Swedenborg nowhere disparages, as our Lord did not that of the

Jewish dispensation in his day, though it was destined ere long to pass away. But we do not learn that our author any where, on that account, *adopts* or *prescribes* this order as designed to be perpetuated in the New Jerusalem. We do not for ourselves find that he distinctly recognizes an earthly priesthood as an element in the New Economy, or that any inaugurations are referred to except such as are spiritual. If there be any such passages we should be glad to have them pointed out.

(i) We do not perceive in this a very satisfactory reply to the objection. The fact that the authority is *conferred* instead of being *assumed* does not militate with our position that the clergy is a "self-perpetuating order." They are certainly a constantly-subsisting body, they are distinct from the laity, and they are introduced into the office by each other. Why does not this constitute a self-perpetuating order? What more would be requisite to do it? As to *appointment*, it avails nothing towards conferring clerical character, on the prevailing theory, apart from ordination.

(j) If we see a bugbear in this, it is because we see with optics badly trained. So deeply for a long tract of ages, has clerical prerogative become entrenched in the prejudices and affections of the Christian world, so completely has it moulded their forms of thought, that it is an immense achievement to get out of the magic circle of associations which it conjures around us, and to look upon the subject in the light of the Lord's Word and of man's wisdom. Who thinks of *public instruction* in a church but in connexion with a consecrated edifice, a pulpit sacred to an ordained occupant, and a passively listening audience? But these are mere adventitious appendages which have grown by slow degrees around the central institute of worship. In like manner with the sacraments, which have been clothed with a pre-eminent degree of sanctity in order to enhance the official sanctity of those who administer them. We would not imply by this that they are not to be reverently regarded as of Divine appointment, but we are yet to learn the grounds

on which the administration of the sacraments is to be prohibited to any but those who have passed through the regular sacerdotal routine and received the due credentials at the hands of the due authorities.

(k) That is, if it be granted in the outset that there is a distinct class of men in the church denominated the clergy, and that they are solemnly introduced into that office by the ceremony of ordination, and can derive a title to the performance of these functions in no other way, then it will indeed follow of course that no one can invade the sacred prerogative without the grossest sacrilege. But it might be as well to remember that we deny this asserted effect of ordination, and consequently the results that follow in its train. We adhere immovably to our position, that the qualification to teach in the church, the love for it as a use, and the acknowledgment of both on the part of a society, authorizes a man to officiate "unimpeached of usurpation" in that capacity, and that no man or body of men has a right to prevent him. Moreover, as the functional use in question is an important one, if the society are pleased to signify their sense of it by selecting some of their number to express, by imposition of hands, accompanied with prayer, their earnest invocation of blessing in the discharge of it, we see nothing in it that is open to reasonable objection. But in admitting this we do not admit that such a rite so consecrates the recipient as to elevate him to another plane of dignity and sanctity.

(l) We ask ourselves again and again where is the peculiar difficulty of apprehending the distinction to which we have so often adverted, and which draws the line between an occasional or even a stated use and a permanent office that constitutes its functionaries *a separate and sacred order of men*. Certain exigencies on the score of instruction in a New Church Society demand the exercise of certain gifts or endowments at certain times. The services requisite are rendered accordingly, just as the teachers in a Sabbath-school perform the duties which, because they were needed, they have consent-

ed to assume. But has this the effect of making them a distinct class of men in the community? Are they not, during the week-days, pursuing their fixed occupation like other citizens and perfectly upon a par with them? Suppose their Sabbath-day employment to be called an "office," still they are properly "officers" no longer than while engaged in it, even though engaged in it statedly and for a term of years. No one ever dreams that they become, in consequence of this function, a distinct order prescriptively invested with the prerogative not only of teaching, but of creating by ordination other teachers. A. E. F. would make the clerical and judicial functions exactly parallel. This would require that the limits of each should be defined with the utmost precision, and that no one should presume any more to invade the province of the minister than the lawyer or the common citizen does that of the judge. But we ask if this is possible? Would A. E. F. undertake to define the precise line which separates the duties of the laity from the prerogatives of the clergy? May not a layman teach any spiritual truth at all? If he may teach *some*, how much? Suppose a warm-hearted Newchurchman in some remote village in Maine or Michigan should be impelled to open his doors on the Sabbath to such of his neighbors as saw fit to attend, and should read, pray, and sing with them, and under the promptings of a full heart should venture to propound his own views of the grand and glorious truths of the New Jerusalem, and urge them upon his audience, by what scale of criminality should we measure his offence? Should we tremble for fear that the doom of Korah and his companions would come upon him? Should we not fear rather that his own soul would suffer leanness were he to withhold that which would tend to remedy the leanness of the souls of others? The fact is, the civil and ecclesiastical spheres are entirely different. It is impossible to bring the principles applicable to each into the same category. Every man of the church is potentially a minister or priest, and the development of the fitting endowments,

together with the consent and acknowledgment of his associates is all that is needed to make him actually so. Assume any more restricted ground and the church has a hierarchy inevitably fixed upon it.

(*m*) All the prevention that may be attempted, short of actual force, amounts simply to non-acknowledgment. A society may refuse to acknowledge as a teacher one who would fain impose himself upon them in that character, but they cannot prevent him from preaching to another society who are willing to hear him, nor if ever so many New Church societies combine and veto his preaching could they prevent his officiating beyond the pale of their jurisdiction. The mere fact of several societies combining confers no new power of prohibition; it simply affords the means of a more united expression of opinion on the subject. One who was intent upon proclaiming what he deemed to be truth, and whose life challenged investigation, would smile at all the edicts that could be launched against him by Synods or Conventions.

(*n*) There is nothing to hinder societies from combining for purposes of use in advancing the Lord's kingdom, but if they suppose that their coming together and "combining into a body" invests them with an authority of "prescribing" what they had not the power to do before, they labor under as great a mistake, as would he who should hold that the whole is more than an aggregate of all the parts.

(*o*) Nothing is more certain than that these words of our author must receive limitation somewhere. With all his zeal for a sharply defined distinction of grades and functions in the church, A. E. F. would not say that none but a clergyman was ever to insinuate truth into the minds of his fellow-men. He must concede the right in some degree—what is it? In some cases—what are they? We will abide by his determination. If he maintains that while in the ordinary intercourse of life every man is at liberty to improve the occasions that may occur for correcting falsity and imparting truth, but that



in the matter of formal instruction in public meetings, for instance, the duty of unfolding and applying the truths of the church should devolve rather upon those who occupy the post of teachers, we have no difficulty in agreeing with him, for we regard such "teaching ministers" or spiritual servants, as a very important element in every society, but we are very far from looking upon them as such a distinct order of men as is now understood by the clergy.

(p) As we put this in the same category with the former extract from the Canons, it will be superfluous to dwell upon it here. We find no evidence that Swedenborg speaks either here or elsewhere of any other clergy as such than that which he recognized in the existing church of his day.

(q) We have guarded our statement sufficiently to rebut the force of this objection, as will appear by italicising another clause of the sentence ;—"As to heretical or incompetent ministers and the proper mode of dealing with them, this, *in a well-ordered state of the Church*, will take care of itself." It is seldom indeed that any reform of moment is effected by itself apart from a reform in the system to which it belongs. We should anticipate with A. E. F. that disorders and irregularities in abundance would be the consequence of such a change as he deems the legitimate consequence of our theory. It is evident from his coupling together "no human priesthood" with "no human government" that he attributes to our views a perfectly subversive or destructive tendency without one redeeming element. It is, however, well to remind ourselves that the bad consequences which might in the first instance flow from the breaking up of a corrupt state of things in church or State are not of themselves a sufficient argument against the plea for reform. In the present case the question is as to the abstract truth of certain principles bearing upon the economy of the church. If the fundamental positions which we assume are intrinsically sound, the *legitimate* consequences can by no possibility be evil. Let that question then be decided.

(*r*) We willingly let all this go for what it is worth, leaving it to our readers to judge how far we differ or how far we agree with the teachings of Swedenborg *rightly understood*. That he has much to say respecting *priests, priesthood, clergy, &c.*, is readily admitted, but that he predicates them of the New Church is not admitted. Thus as to imposition of hands, he says, *C. L.* 396, "Because the hands are the ultimates of man, and his firsts are simultaneously in ultimates, it is that inaugurations into the priesthood *are at this day* performed by the laying on of hands." But upon this head we cannot now dilate.

(*s*) There is but little prospect of bringing controversies to a close so long as either of the parties misconstrues the leading position of the other, or puts *its own sense* on an opponent's terms and then waxes valiant in contending with it. We have nowhere denied that the function of teaching exists and always has existed in the Church, consequently that there are to be teachers. But we deny that these teachers are identical with the clergy of the present day, an order of men which, from the love of dominion, has grafted itself upon that of the teachers aforesaid, and in a thousand forms of usurpation "lorded it over God's heritage." To what does it amount then to say that the clergy, as a distinct body, dates itself far back of the rise of the spirit of domination? This is a spirit which allows very few things indeed to date back of it. The clergy, in the sense of teachers, or, if you please, of teaching ministers, existed from the origin of Christian Societies, but the clergy, in the sense of the priesthood, is of far later growth, and is the undoubted offspring of the love of dominion, as any candid man will see who reads father Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, or Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History.

(*t*) The effect is here, if we mistake not, unwittingly put for the cause and the cause for the effect. The doctrines of absolution, of the power of the keys, and of apostolic succession, were not born till the love of domination begot them, nor will they die so long as their fos-

ter parent the clergy survives to nourish them. The idea of a separate order of clergy subsisting in total disjunction from the abuses which have ever accompanied it is, in our view, chimerical.

(u) The course of reasoning which our friend pursues throughout his article leans very strongly and naturally to a most lenient and tolerant view of the church of the Papacy, as the arguments by which both systems are sustained have a marked affinity for each other. Indeed, with the abatement or exception which he specifies, we cannot perceive how, upon his ground, the constitution of the Roman Church could have been "highly inexpedient." Highly *expedient* would sound in our ears as the more appropriate epithet. We are often amused at the efforts made to separate the dross and still retain the virgin gold of Rome. The grand fact, however, still remains inexpugnable that the sacerdotal heresy is the mother and the munition of the papal apostasy.

(v) We must put this down as a singular specimen of hyper-refinement in the way of confuting an axiomatic principle of the New Church, to wit, that every good man is a church in the least form; from which, we maintain, it follows that if the priestly function is an essential element of the church, that element exists in every individual of the church. And how is this replied to? "The man is composed of goods and truths, two perfectly distinct things; priests correspond, in the collective church, with goods, and the laity, consequently with truths, and as goods and truths are distinct, the clergy and laity must be distinct also." But where does our respondent learn that the laity corresponds with truths? We by no means admit his "consequently" on this head. The priestly principle does indeed both in the Lord and in man correspond to good, but the proper counterpart to this is not any lay-principle corresponding to truth, but the *regal* principle of which truth is the genuine basis. Therefore it is said that under the New Dispensation we are made *priests* and *kings*, but not *priests* and *laymen*. The priests under the Old Dispensation

were distinct from the laity by the very nature of their office, and when it is said that under the New all become priests, it follows that the former distinction is of course done away; that they are all upon the same plane, though there may still be diversity of functions and uses; and that the spiritual forms of goodness and truth in the collective man of the church are priesthood and kingship, so that if there is an external order of priests on the one hand there must be an external order of kings on the other. Does our friend recognize his refutation when it comes before him in this form, or does he exclaim, "*Quantum mutatus ab illo!*"

(w) If our correspondent had here quoted our remarks upon the passage referred to, it would have been apparent, we think, that the force of the objection built upon it was effectually done away. As it is, we must rely upon the reader's courtesy to refer to it (N. C. Repos., Dec., 1849).

(x) We may oftentimes admit the abstract truth of a principle affirmed to hold in a particular analogy, and yet refuse to admit that the principle can be fairly applied in the case which the analogy is designed to illustrate or confute. In the present instance we have no quarrel with what A. E. F. says about the order of influx, &c., but we do not concede that it overthrows the truth of our position. We do not grant that the origination of the *true* ministry from societies is superseded by any subsequent state of things into which the infancy of the church resolves itself. "It is a matter of necessity that the *first* ordination should be by the laity; but it is in vain to rely upon this as proof that it should be so *always*." We seem to be shut up to the frequent re-statement of our main position as the true answer to nearly every argument of our opponent. With him the great point is ordination as that in which the essence of the clerical office consists; with us the main question is as to the office itself, which we understand to be a function of use performed by certain persons duly qualified, but still standing upon the same plane with the mass of

the members of the society in whose behoof they officiate. In the first selection or appointment of these individuals we see no objection to the members expressing their concurrence in the choice by the rite of imposition of hands, either in their own persons or by proxy, as convenience may dictate, though we maintain that this act does nothing towards investing them with authority, or elevating them into a distinct superior order, but merely implies a cordial assent to the appointment and an earnest invocation of the divine blessing upon the new relation which is now to be established between the parties. The ceremony may properly enough be performed, if the society sees fit, while at the same time we see no such absolute necessity for it as that the validity of the function shall be annulled by reason of its absence. And so in regard to subsequent appointments to the same office in the same society. The existing functionaries may ordain new ones, as circumstances may require, with the same interpretation of the import of the rite as in the first instance. It is a decent and becoming ceremony, tending no doubt to enhance the impressiveness of the occasion, but devoid of that peculiar sanctity and indispensable necessity which has been claimed for it. Our readers will judge from these remarks how much weight we assign to A. E. F.'s position that "you cannot govern a *man* by the laws of *embryo* life, and you should not make the church, *full-grown*, conform to the model of its *forming* stage." We are unable to see why the simplest form of a New Church society should not be permanent, just as we have reason to believe that the *forms* of the heavenly societies are permanent. If so, the process we have described above of furnishing societies with teachers is all that is requisite, and the reasoning of our correspondent on the subject is answered.

## A TRAINED AND PROFESSIONAL CLERGY.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM AN ENGLISH CORRESPONDENT.

[N. C. Repos., May, 1851.]

YOUR fear of having given offence by your speculations to your English brethren, I think you may dismiss at once. If I may judge from my own limited circle, the impression produced is a feeling of regret that your mode of improving *our* views of clerical institutions, has been so much mixed up with the external and personal affairs of the *United States Institutions* in the *N. C.*(a) ; and also that we cannot *clearly see or firmly grasp* your views of what is best to be understood and done, in regard to the relation in question, that is, *practically*, either as regards the present time, or the immediate future.(b) I find this same difficulty in your letter ; and I hesitate what course to take ; to point out, by a reference to *your own words*, such as “ exclusive class,” “ monopoly,” “ distinct caste” and “ order,” “ permanent order,” &c., *how you puzzle me* ; or to state *my own simple view* of the main points of the subject. As the shortest course, I will take the latter, first remarking, that I cannot admit that in your controversy *any sense of teaching* by priests was admissible, except that in *public worship*. Any other sense could only generate confusion.(c)

I see no need to consult Swedenborg or the Word to ascertain *specially whether we want religious teachers* (called by Americans “ clergy,” but clergy here mean Established Church ministers only) to instruct those who assemble for worship on Sundays. Common sense, founded on experience, is an *all-sufficient guide*. It is a *settled* point that Christians should use public worship, and no one doubts that a part of the engagements on such occasions should be *instruction*. Then : Query—Who is to give this instruction ? Answer—The most efficient persons available. Query—Should they be persons specially trained to do so, and rendered more efficient by appropriate, regular, and constant mental culture, suitable to their work, and perfected by the practice and habit of teaching ? Or should the teaching be given *extempore* by any person *chancing* to be present, on being called upon ? Answer—When it can be proved that an extempore doctor and lawyer, without special training for their respective vocations, are more efficient than regularly trained doctors and lawyers, then, and not before, it will be proved, that extempore, or rather improvisatore, religious teachers, are the best. Query—Is it well, then, to have a trained body of teachers, called by a peculiar designation, who shall devote themselves *for life* to the office, and be a distinct body from the taught, called in contradistinction by another designation ? Answer—Lawyers, doctors and schoolmasters

devote their lives to their work, and why not religious teachers and pastors? As to the designation, of what consequence is it, except as it is necessary to facilitate the understanding of speech? We have clergy and laity; but the laity only means those who are not clergy. In law we, in Great Britain, have lawyers and "*laymen*," the latter being those who are not lawyers, including, I presume, clergymen. In physic, we have doctors and the un-professional. These are *real* distinctions, and nothing more is meant by the designations descriptive of them *in one case than the other*. Thus we say, "clergy and laity," not to mark a stronger or different line than that which exists between the operators and operated upon, in the other cases. The clergy are no more a distinct body from the rest, than the lawyers and doctors are distinct from the rest. Lawyers and doctors are esteemed according to their talents and known acquirements, and why should not religious teachers obtain influence and employment on the same grounds? The country wants the use, and wants it performed in the best manner, and therefore wants those who can do it best, and therefore should encourage those who have best qualified themselves for their work, to adopt the office for life. (d)

In the first ages of Christianity, according to Peter, there existed a *spiritual* priesthood; and there were also *religious teachers*; it does not appear necessary to connect the latter fact with the former, either then, or in the *N. C.* The former is an *invisible* body, and each one should take care that he is a member of it; but what has this to do with providing for the instruction of the people on Sundays? except, indeed, so far as this—that if we *can see* in a candidate for the teacher's or pastor's vocation traces of character such as belongs to the *spiritual* priesthood, combined with effective talents for teaching, we have good ground for receiving him, since the former without the latter, or the latter without the former, would be useless in a teacher. But it appears to me that the traces of the *spiritual* priesthood, as existing in the lawyer or doctor, are scarcely less important for them in their vocation, than for the religious teachers in theirs. Paul was a great religious teacher *appointed of God*, but where, according to the Diary of E. S., was his *spiritual* priesthood? Divine Wisdom, in his case, constituted a man a religious teacher, who was not then, and perhaps not likely to become, a *spiritual* priest. This proves that we shall not fatally err by choosing for a religious teacher a man who appears to be a spiritual priest, but is not. Now, all this being granted, how can it be avoided to make a distinction in name between clergy and laity, while there is such a palpable distinction in fact? You admit that the terms clergy, teachers or priests. "*indicate a certain form of use*," but you affirm that those who perform that use are not a distinct order. Now, my dear sir, I can make nothing out of this but your saying, that they *are actually* distinct, being distinguished by a distinct use, but they must not be accounted or *said* to be so! If your ideas are better than those here suggested, your words are not worthy of them. Lawyers and doctors are a *distinct* order, and the only marked differ-

ence is, that they deal with individuals, while teachers deal with aggregate bodies; and partly, perhaps, in consequence of the latter being the case, it has been found expedient that the covenant between the taught and the teacher should be marked by a public ceremonial, which is arranged in various forms, called Ordinations—the covenant being the principal and essential thing, and the mode of ratifying it, the instrumental or non-essential. The covenant is a fact—that cannot be questioned; and all talk about ordination is not, properly, talk about the clergy as a fact, but a discussion about the mode of celebrating a fact relating to them.

We have nothing to do with the views of the future N. C. about clergy: *we have only to provide for our own wants*, and as well and as wisely as we can. When the N. J. attains its glory, there will, perhaps, be no doctors and no lawyers, and no teachers *such as we now require*; but *what have we to do with that?* Is it not to us a matter of profitless speculation? *What we want we must have*, and leave the wants of the future to suggest their suitable supplies. There is quite as good reason for discontinuing lawyers and doctors *now*, as for abolishing the clergy *now*, because hereafter none of them may be wanted. Let each age do the best it can for itself. Sufficient unto the day are the *duties* thereof.

But you might say, "All this is very well, but you know that the Bostonians and others have gone to E. S. to find grounds for a hierarchy of three orders, having peculiar and exclusive privileges and powers." Certainly, and you have declared that you do not accept their ecclesiastical constitution, as you had a right to declare; and you have given your reasons for it; and all I meant to say above in regard to your reasons is, that I wish you had proceeded more according to the *short usual process of argument*, than according to U. S. N. C. fashion, by so many *questionable and uncertain references to E. S.* Of course I regard his authority as conclusive, but *only* when he is *obviously speaking to the very point in dispute*, or when *indisputably* his already expressed general principles *obviously* bear upon it. *Constructive conclusions*, I like as well, or rather as little, as the old constructive treasons in politics;—one seeks to get your mind into thrall, and the other, your body.

If people's common conception does not qualify them to judge by the rule of utility whether there should be a trine of clerical grades or not, it seems to me, that all disputing *with them*, to show that their conclusions from E. S. are perversions, will be *lost upon them*; but for the sake of the lookers on, I admit, it is needful for some who feel their vocation for the work, to show that the conclusions referred to *are* perversions. But this will require concentration of force and great care, to avoid getting into a course of reasoning and disputes on inconclusive, or misunderstood, or misapplied passages of E. S., as interminable as is ineffective. It is like arguing by parallels, where nearly all the time is occupied in pointing out *want of parallelism*.

It is said of some people, that they have all sorts of sense except



common sense, and it appears to me that E. S., *according to your representation of his meaning*, must be numbered with such characters; that is, if, in writing the chapter *On Ecclesiastical and Civil Government*, he only traced what ought to be done in the *Old Church* by priests and people, in relation to each other, when *all the while* he knew that the *Old Church* was *incorrigible*, and was about to be superseded by the *New*! He knew also, according to your reading, that what he pronounced good for the *O. C.*, though impossible to it, *would not be good for the N. C.*, AND YET HE OMITTED TO SAY SO!! He is evidently speaking of or to a church that he *meant to profit* by his suggestions, and therefore must have thought *such benefit attainable*: I put it to your candor, therefore, and in justice to E. S., was *that church* which E. S. addressed the utterly ruined *O. C.*, which *cannot* be benefited; or another church which *can*? If the latter, what church could that be *except the N. C.*? Why, then, charge him by implication, with violating common sense, first by prescribing impossibilities to the *O. C.*; and, secondly, by not warning the *N. C.* that what he said was exclusively meant for the *O. C.*, notwithstanding the *title of the book*—"The *N. Jerusalem* and its *Heavenly Doctrines*?" You place E. S., by your limitation of his meaning, in an *inextricable dilemma*. In any point of view, you make him wanting in common sense. You make him like a physician who should carefully take measures to convey to his son, after his death, a prescription labelled *for him*, and which appeared on the face of it, to be intended for his son's use, but which, in fact, was nothing but a prescription which one of his dead patients *had neglected to take*; and, if taken by the son, would infallibly poison him. Such I think is a fair parallel to the case drawn by you of the conduct of our spiritual physician Swedenborg, in regard to this chapter!(e)

## REMARKS.

(a) We had no special reference, in the tenor of our remarks, to the state of things among our English brethren. We had no aim to "improve their views of clerical institutions," but wrote mainly with the actual condition of the *New Church* in our own country in our eye. At the same time, we have endeavored to unfold the general principles which lie at the foundation of the whole subject, and which are of course universally applicable.

(b) Our brother is doubtless aware that there is always a difficulty in "seeing clearly" and "grasping firmly" a train of thought which goes counter to the whole current of our previous notions, especially when it questions the soundness of principles that form the basis of usages, in-

stitutions, and politics with which he has been familiar from childhood, and which are made venerable by historic recollection. We would not quote the pungent aphoristic couplet of Cowper with any personal allusion to our correspondent; but it is *apropos* as expressive of a general fact in human experience,—

“The text that suits not to his darling whim,  
Though clear to others, is obscure to him.”

We are at least greatly at a loss to conceive that the views which we have advanced on the theme of the ministry and its relative topics is at all difficult of apprehension considered as a theory. But the *practical* carrying them out is another matter. And here we must repeat what we have said before, that we have not propounded our sentiments with a view to any abrupt or violent change in the existing order of things. We would have every thing ripen by due degrees. Seeds of thought, like seeds of plants, may be properly sown, with the full understanding that they are to lie for a longer or shorter time in the mental soil before they germinate, and still longer before they come to maturity. In the present instance we have thrown out suggestions bearing upon the true constitution and order of the New Church, the *tendency* of which is undoubtedly to operate important changes, not only of opinion, but of action on these subjects, as to which, however, we still trust to the good sense and wisdom of reflecting men not to precipitate results even from principles that are intrinsically sound. That which is essentially reformatory need not be at the same time violently revolutionary.

(c) We will not quarrel with this position, although we should no doubt differ from our friend as to the prominence which was to be given to *teaching* as a department of public worship. But of this more in what follows.

(d) The course of reasoning here adopted proceeds, we think, upon an inadequate view, not only of the true ends of worship, but also of the true constituents of

a Church. "Theology," says Jeremy Taylor, "is not so much a divine doctrine as a divine life." This is entirely in accordance with the scope of the informations imparted to the New Church. The aim of its doctrines is to develope a new life wherever they are received, and the elements of this new life are the same in all. Wherever they exist, there is the church in its least form indeed, but in all its *essential* fulness; consequently, every requisite function of the Church must potentially reside in every individual member of the Church. How this can consist with the exclusive possession of the teaching prerogative by any distinct order, class, or caste of men, is what we are unable either "clearly to see or firmly to grasp." And yet as here, if any where, is the fundamental fallacy of our position, it claims to be directly met and answered. Instead of doing this, however, our astute correspondent plants his battery against the practical operation of the scheme, by showing up its impotency to secure the desirable ends of religious instruction as a part of public worship. How shall a man teach to any advantage who has not been duly qualified by previous training and culture for the work? And how can this important function be secured in the Church, except by means of a trained body of teachers, called by a special designation, devoted to the office for life, and thus necessarily constituting a distinct and exclusive class? And is not such a class as completely contradistinguished, in the nature of the case, from the taught as are doctors and lawyers from patients and clients? It is easy to see the extreme plausibility of this kind of argument, and yet it is very far from carrying conviction to our mind. It is not satisfactory, inasmuch as it appears to us to give to the understanding the prominence due rather to the will, and to imply that instruction, instead of devotion, is the principal object of worship. As we read the genius of the Lord's kingdom, his people come together in worship rather for the purpose of bringing the offerings of praise, adoration, and grateful love, for looking to the Lord, seeking a direct

influx of divine good to their souls, and for the quickening of every holy impulse of feeling, than for the edification of the intellect. In a word, we regard the will rather than the understanding, as the principle mainly concerned in worship. The great end to be attained by it we consider to be the quickening of the devout affections—the reinforcement of love to the Lord and charity to the neighbor, and all the minor graces of the regenerating spirit. At the same time, as the opening of the Word in its spiritual sense, and its application to the personal conscience, conduces to the ends of worship, so we freely admit the propriety of such instruction on such occasions; and as to the dispensers of it, the natural impression would be, that those would be the best qualified for it who were most fully furnished with it, and those surely might be presumed to be most in truth who were most in good, as all genuine truth is from genuine good. So far as we can see, all in the Church are required to be equally assiduous in the cultivation of goods and truths, and all have an equal interest in the spiritual well-being of the whole body. It is ordered, too, that the gifts of each should be made available to the behoof all, and we regard it as simply impossible that any member of the Church should be truly in the life and spirit of the Church, without being able to impart useful instruction in some form to his brethren. He can no more lack this ability than a healthy organ in a healthy human body can fail to elaborate its use in the general economy of the system. Nothing can be more apropos in this connexion, than Paul's illustration;—"From whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." That there will ever be some in every society better qualified to impart instruction than others, is beyond question; and if so, let them chiefly exercise the function. But let them not, on this account, make an exclusive prerogative of what is essentially a common privilege and a common duty.

From what we have now said, it will be seen that we think little of the force of the argument drawn from the supposed parallel case of the doctor and the lawyer. The cases are not parallel. The vocations of the doctor and the lawyer require of necessity the attainment of knowledges diverse from those of the mass of the community among whom their respective professions are practiced. A peculiar training is therefore requisite in their case, because the end is peculiar. They are to do what their patients and clients cannot be expected to do, and they are to prepare themselves accordingly. But how is it in a Church? What is a Church society in its essential nature? Is it not an association formed for purposes in which every member has the same interest with every other member? Is there not the utmost community of object prevailing among those who belong to it? And is not this object one that has relation mainly to life? Is not the Church rather a school of life than a seminary of science? What interest have the so-called teachers apart from that of the taught? What does it behoove one to know which it does not another? How then can there be a basis for a distinction of classes similar to those of physic and law? Or with what justice can the *peculiarity* in the one sphere of use be offset against the *community* in the other? As to the *extempore* character of the instructions given under the supposed order of things, our correspondent surely will not deny that under a glowing state of heavenly affection there may be and often is, not only a special interior illustration, but a freedom, fluency, and pertinency of speech, that the most elaborate preparation from the memory can scarcely approach. But how absurd the supposition that the Divine influx should inspire doctors and lawyers to act the improvisator in this manner in the discharge of their professional duties! The comparison is altogether inappropriate, as in the one case we are dealing with an art or science which is necessarily limited to a class, and which must be acquired by a special course of training; whereas, in the other, we

contemplate a form of spiritual and moral life, the functions and obligations of which pertain equally to every individual. We must of course be aware that the carrying out of the views now advanced necessarily supposes a very altered state of things in the Church, from the past or present; and we are entirely willing that our argument should be taken with all the abatement that may accrue to it from the imputation of being *impracticable* in the present condition of things in the world. We are deeply sensible that the standard of *life* is altogether too low to allow us to cherish the hope that existing usages and institutes may be dispensed with for a long time to come; nor, as we have already said, have we any disposition to precipitate a new era, in this respect, in the Church. But we have no reserve in proposing the subject for consideration. We hesitate not to offer suggestions. A commencement must be made at some time or other. It will devolve upon some one to broach the topic for the first, and we know not that it is ever too early to announce the ideas which are destined in the end to counteract the evils of long established institutions. In the present case we have no debate with our correspondent as to the fact of the usefulness of the clergy in the present order of things ecclesiastical in all Christian countries, nor do we question for a moment that the more richly endowed, intellectually and spiritually, are the Pastors of Churches, the more useful will they be. On this head we can afford to make the amplest concessions. But the true question is, first, whether the distinction of clergy and laity as everywhere understood, rests upon a solid basis of truth; and, secondly, whether taking every thing into view, the disadvantages attending the present system are not such as to outweigh its advantages. The latter proposition may be presumed, if the former be admitted, for what is not warranted by the Word, is not to be expected to be expedient on the whole. For ourselves we see abundant grounds of doubt on both these points. We see the great body of the Church virtually released from duties

and uses which cannot in our view be justly alienated or made over to any other party. We see under the present system a sinking of individual responsibility in the prominence given, and the importance attached to clerical agency, which cannot but be eventually attended with disastrous effects upon the best interests of the Lord's kingdom in the hearts of his people. We see in this system the germ of all that hierarchy which has been from the earliest ages of the Christian Church the bane of its prosperity, and the presage of similar evils in the Church of the New Jerusalem. It is for this reason that the subject has weighed heavily on our thoughts, and as we have believed so have we spoken. It is on this ground that we would plant our reply to what is urged in a subsequent part of the above letter in respect to our non-concern in the Church's future. We confess to no little surprise on this head. "We have only to provide for our own wants, and as well and wisely as we can. When the New Jerusalem attains its glory there will, perhaps, be no doctors, and no lawyers, and no teachers such as we (now) require, but what have we to do with that? Is it not to us a matter of profitless speculation?" It is surely the part of charity to consult the well-being of those who shall come after us as well as to study the good of our coevals. It is no matter of "profitless speculation" to determine the *principles* which should govern the Church in its ecclesiastical relations in our own day, and if these principles are sound, we ought to feel an anxious desire that their operation may be perpetuated. Surely we cannot be true to our better promptings, and still be indifferent to the highest welfare of the Church in after ages. Can we see evils in existence in the Church of the present, and not desire to have them eradicated from the Church of the future? Shall we not aim to hand down this precious inheritance to posterity purged to the utmost of imperfections and in a form most prolific of blessing? At the same time there is a fallacy in the idea that we cannot consult the interests of the future without violently abrogating

the present. It is not necessary to "abolish the clergy *now*," in order to secure the benefits for our posterity, which we would fain compass. All that we propose is, that the subject should be candidly weighed, and if any real errors or evils are indicated, that they should be gradually corrected, as the wisdom of the Church shall deem expedient. Is there any thing ultra or extravagant in this?

(e) Instead of repeating our former arguments on this head, we will propose one query to our friend, the writer of the letter. In the *H. D.* (No. 315) we find the following:—"With respect to priests, their duty is to teach men the way to heaven, and likewise to lead them therein. They are to teach them according to the doctrine of *their Church*, (*ecclesiæ suæ*.) which is derived from the Word of God; and to lead them to live according to that doctrine." What is to be understood by the phrase "*their Church*" in this connexion? It will be seen indeed that the force of the expression is altogether lost in our translation, which renders it "*the Church*;" but we have given the original, which, in the letter is too plain to be misunderstood. What is its fair interpretation? Does it not imply that the priests or ministers of the *several* Churches in Christendom, as the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, the Episcopal, the Baptist, the Methodist, &c., are to teach according to the tenets which these bodies respectively hold as being, in their view, derived from the Word of God? If so, it obviously confirms our construction of the whole article, and this impression is strengthened by the consideration that a monarchical form of government for the State is as unequivocally prescribed as is a priestly order for the Church. Our correspondent will no doubt find some way of getting smoothly over the difficulty, but there it stands, and many there are, ourselves among the number, who do not know how to reconcile it with such a view of the whole chapter as the writer contends for.



## THE PARTY OF ORDER AND THE PARTY OF LIBERTY.

[N. C. Repos., March, 1852.]

WE insert the following from an esteemed brother at the West, because we are always happy to receive the friendly hints of brethren in the Church, and because it affords us an opportunity of adding a few words on the general subject to which the writer alludes.

M—— C——, Feb. 1, 1852.

DEAR SIR,

Inclosed you have two dollars for the current year of the Repository. Mr. S., whose subscription I sent last year, is not disposed to renew; the course of the Repository the past year has not been attractive to novitates.

For myself I have been highly interested in the discussions on the subject of Church order, though they appear to have occupied too large a space. I cannot, however, apart from this, acknowledge myself satisfied with the style of most of the articles on these subjects. Each party seems to view but *one side* of the questions at issue, and to be anxious rather to present their own partial conceptions, than to develop those universal principles in which truths of every phase are seen to harmonize. Hence but little progress is made; few are satisfied, and if any are silenced, it is because they are weary of the subject, rather than convinced or enlightened. Each party appears to withhold the light from the very part of its position which is earnestly questioned by the other side — whether from conscious weakness or distrust does not clearly appear.

The party of "order" are careful to say very little about the source of their authority, or of those grand principles of freedom of thought and freedom of utterance which are supposed to conflict with their pretensions. On the other hand, the partizans of "liberty" are equally silent upon questions of organization, subordination, and authority, which are generally held to be essential to united and harmonious action, and when pressed with quotations from Swedenborg, have been vain to appeal to other quotations from the same authority, with scarcely an attempt to reconcile them.

Now I hold that such a state of things is disgraceful, especially when taken in connection with the pretensions of the New Church to superior illumination, and I do most sincerely hope and pray that this

one-sided business may cease. Let none presume to dogmatize till he can cover the whole ground, and without evasion harmoniously reconcile order with freedom, the rights of man with his duties, as involved in this question.

A slight attempt was made to accomplish this in the argument from analogy which formed a part of the Majority report on this subject to the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Michigan and Northern Indiana Association, which report you were pleased to notice in a very favorable manner. I think that the principles presented in that report, if properly developed, will be found to meet the difficulties of the subject in the most satisfactory manner. I am aware that some portions of it have been subjected to an unfavorable criticism in the (English) *New Church Review*, and for some time I contemplated a reply, in which I should have shown, that in the most important matter of difference the report was misunderstood by the reviewer; but want of time, and finally the withdrawal of the copy of the review itself prevented me.

However, should the subject be pursued in the *Repository*, and should circumstances favor me, I will, with your permission, endeavor, in a brief article, to present the matter anew, with such further explanations and developments as may seem advisable.

I remain, very truly yours,

R. H. M.

#### REMARKS.

We have before taken occasion to express some degree of surprise that the thorough discussion of the subject of church order in our pages should have proved so distasteful to a large portion of our readers. It cannot be denied that the subject is intrinsically important, and therefore entitled to the most candid and serious consideration of every member of the church. Nor do we see any reason to doubt that views have been held and assumptions put forth, in connection with this theme, which it was perfectly proper should be called in question, and submitted to the ordeal of the Word and the writings. So far as our own humble essays are concerned, this is what we have attempted to do. Others who have shared in our sentiments, have ably seconded our efforts, and subjected the opposite views to a searching analysis. Meantime we have freely opened our pages to the advocates of the prevailing "order," and given them every opportunity to defend and confirm

their positions. So far no just exceptions, we think, can be taken to our course. No one can object to our giving a fair hearing to both sides of all important but disputed topics. The exception taken, however, by our correspondent, is not so much to the *fact* of the discussion as to the *mode* in which it has been conducted. Each party has taken a *one-sided* view of the matter, and aimed to present "its own partial conceptions, rather than to develop those universal principles in which truths of every phase are seen to harmonize." This may be so, but such a process of umpirage is usually the result of the successive pleadings of the parties concerned, when each has brought forth and set in array the strong reasons upon which its opinions are based. The first object in such a discussion is generally to assail some established error of faith or institution, and to expose the fallacy of the reasonings on which it rests. This can seldom be done without converting mild discussion into excited controversy; for there are usually so many interests wrapped up in existing systems, that the least approach to an investigation awakens at once the signal of alarm, and the whole force of the citadel sallies forth to repel the invaders—who must be enemies of course—from the consecrated precincts. The self-styled assailed can seldom see any other than sinister motives in the assailants, as they are invidiously termed, and the hard measure of censure and reproach which they are prone to deal out, no doubt tends very much to awaken somewhat of a similar spirit, and both parties become more or less blinded to the real merits of each other's positions. In this way the spirit of charity is wounded, and the interests of truth for a time suffer. But in the meanwhile light has been elicited from the collision of views, and when the excitement of the occasion has passed away, some more dispassionate mind takes up the subject of debate from a higher stand-point, and brings it precisely to such an issue as our friend desiderates in the above letter.

Of the two parties hinted at and designated by our

correspondent, we should ourselves undoubtedly fall into that of "liberty," and of this he says, that the partizans are "silent upon questions of organization, subordination, and authority, which are generally held to be essential to united and harmonious action, and when pressed with quotations from Swedenborg, have been fain to appeal to other quotations from the same authority, with scarcely an attempt to reconcile them." Now to this we have something to offer by way of reply. It would be strange indeed if we had much to propound of the "nature of organization, subordination, and authority;" when this is the very rock on which, in our view, the Church has been in danger of splitting, and of which we have been anxious to warn her. What system of external "organization, subordination, and authority" have we to propose, when the very drift of all our reasonings has been to show that charity is itself an essential organizing principle, and that no man or society can possibly be in the genuine charity of the Church, without being actually organized in reference to every other man and society that is under the influence of the same principle. On this head we beg leave to introduce a paragraph from an article of our own, published under the signature of "Eusebius" in the Repository for Jan. 1850. "Every society (in the New Church) is to be left in the fullest enjoyment of its freedom in the management of its own concerns. It is responsible to no power or tribunal save that of the Lord, except just so far as every organ and member of the human body is responsible to the whole, as being a component part of the whole and required to conspire, in its place and office, to the production of the general unity of effect in the whole. So far as one life, in its orderly influx, pervades and governs the entire body of the Church, so far there will necessarily be a sympathetic and reciprocal co-working of its multi-form constituents, all tending to one paramount result, and that whether there be any such thing as conventions or councils, or not. If the Divine influx be rightly and adequately received by any organism, whether phy-

sical or spiritual, there will be of necessity a consentaneous action of the several component parts, tending to one ruling end, just as real and as effective as if it had proceeded from the *voluntary* and *conscious* purpose of those parts. An associated religious body, i. e., a body associated by the profession of the same faith, existing in true order, may be considered as having a *cerebellum* which presides over all its involuntary motions, as well as a *cerebrum* that controls the voluntary, and the functions of the former are no less conducive to the weal of the whole than if they were governed by the direct conscious volition of the cerebral intelligence."

Now in this we deem ourselves to have asserted a genuine principle of the New Church, and if so it is entitled to be imperative upon our faith; if not, let its fallacy be shown. But it will perhaps be said that though the principal is correct, yet our inference from it is unsound—that an internal organization will necessarily ultimate itself in an external one, and thus we shall of necessary consequence have essentially that visible church order which is contended for. To this we reply, that there can be no *end* to be answered by an external organization except an *end of use*, for *use* is what is constantly regarded by the charity of the church as an internal organizing principle. And what is the grand use which the life of the church incessantly breathes after and effects? Is it not the increase and propagation of itself? Is it not the diffusion and multiplication of its truths and goods? Consequently whatever of associated or co-operative efforts may be requisite for this end, and which shall not trench upon the personal freedom, or supersede the individual action, of each member, is entirely proper, expedient, and wise. But this concession will afford no warrant for any legislative council or convention. The Church has nothing to legislate about. Its laws are all made and have only to be *lived*. The sole uses to be attained by occasional or stated meetings of New Church men or New Church societies are those which respect the ordering of its worship, the promotion

of its spiritual life, and the widest dissemination of its doctrines as embodied in the writings of the Church. The creation of a ministry is no part of the functions of such meetings. The ministry is entirely and exclusively the offspring of the several societies composing the larger bodies, and these bodies are merely voluntary assemblages meeting from time to time as convenience of locality may dictate without being organically consolidated into permanent ecclesiastical unions, analogous to the political confederacies which we call States. The claim on the part of conventional bodies to be the true source of ministerial power can never be allowed without at the same time planting the seed from which the tree of hierarchy will be sure to grow. The ministry is evermore prior to all bodies composed in whole or in part of ministers. Whatever, then, be the use of conventions, it is something apart from the creation of a clergy. But upon this point we have been sufficiently explicit on former occasions.

Our leading idea on organization will be made still clearer by referring again to the prototypal form and fabric of the human body. What were more strange or *outré* than to imagine the different organs and viscera taking counsel together and entering into a compact to act in unison in producing the normal effects of the several functions? What is the use of such a compact when every portion of the body performs its office by virtue of its being *in* the body and governed by its influent life? So in the spiritual body, the Church. Every one by living and acting in his place most perfectly fulfils his use, and works for the welfare of the whole. What other organization is needed in the latter body any more than in the former? Occasional or even stated meetings within their certain territorial limits, for consultation or co-operation does not amount to any external organization of the Church in strict propriety of speech.

They are more nearly allied to the great benevolent societies of the age, which would be acting a strange

part if they were to identify themselves with the church, and maintain that their organization was the organization of the Church. All genuine New Church associations and conventions we hold to be of a similar character—simply an expedient for furthering the interests of the church without aspiring to form an essential part of its constitution.

What then means our correspondent by saying that the “partizans of liberty are silent upon questions of organization, subordination and authority.” What shall we say about them? What is to be organized? What is to be subordinated, and to what? What authority is to be assumed and acknowledged? Can he or will he define his drift on these points?

But he intimates again that the party in question “when pressed with quotations from Swedenborg, have been fain to appeal to other quotations from the same authority, with scarcely an attempt to reconcile them.” And why should we attempt to reconcile them? What have we to do to assume the task which devolves on our opponents? We urge, upon the authority of our great teacher, one grand fundamental principle—to wit, that every man of the church is a church in the least form. The principle involves in effect the whole of our positions on church order. It is clear, deliberate, distinct, indubitable. Against it a man may heap up detached quotations till doomsday, and what does it avail? Here stands the inexpugnable principle, and by this principle stand we. We have nothing to do with quotations till the truth of this principle is denied and its fallacy shown. So long as the principle remains unshaken, we know that no quotation, rightly construed, can countervail it. If there appears to be a literal conflict, that is the concern of our opponents, and not ours. We recognize no conflict, no discrepancy. In our view all is consistent and harmonious. On this ground we await calmly the result. Hitherto there has been the most careful shunning of contact with the principle above stated. The writers on the other side have played around and around it, but have never ventured directly to encounter

it. What wonder that so little progress is made in the discussion when our main averment is left argumentatively untouched, and merely a host of quotations, like those accumulated by Mr. Cabell in reply to A. W., are arrayed against it? To the force of all such quotations we are utterly insensible so long as the central fortress of our reasoning is winked out of sight.

To the judgment of our readers, then, we submit whether the intimations of our correspondent are well founded. The discussion has, indeed, in a sense been *one-sided*, for on our part it has been what we deem the advocacy of the side of truth against the side of error, and in this controversy we do not care to be found on both sides. It were a singular imputation to have cast upon Luther and his compeers, that in exposing the abominations of Popery that they took entirely a *one-sided* view of the subject. They would undoubtedly at once have owned to the charge while they greatly wondered at it. If it be said that our positions are too sweeping, that we would abolish what is good as well as what is evil in the existing order of things, we can only say that we would be grateful for specifications on this head. We would not abolish meetings nor ministries. We would not dispense with order nor form. But we would plead for true order and true form—for right meetings and right ministries—and what these are in contradistinction from those hitherto established cannot but be gathered from the drift of what we have so abundantly said on the subject. Should there, however, be any point on which we could be desired to speak more explicitly, we should be happy to respond when the desideratum is indicated.



## APHORISMS ON SLAVERY AND ABOLITION.

[N. C Repos., April to Sept.]

WE have for some time been conscious of a prompting to broach in some way, in our pages, the subject of the present communication, as we have no doubt that it may be discussed as a department of New Church duty in a New Church spirit. Large numbers of our brethren of the church residing in the Southern States are connected in one way or other with the institution, and as the moral sentiment of the North, representing both the New Church and the Old, is at this day seriously and somewhat sternly interrogating the whole spirit and genius of the system, it seems no more than is due from the courtesy of fellow recipients of the heavenly doctrines that they should account to each other for any modes of thinking or acting which are calculated to give offence or wound the spirit of brotherly love. If such a requisition be made in the spirit of meekness, with no intention to denounce, vilify, or irritate, but simply from the promptings of the great law of charity, and with the most sincere design to give a candid hearing to every argument or apology that may be offered in behalf of the cause which they are upholding, we are unable to see in this any real ground of complaint or disaffection on the part of our Southern friends. We are well aware indeed that the subject has not always been broached in a manner adapted to secure a kindly or even patient attention on the part of slaveholders, and we can make all charitable allowance for the sensitiveness with which every thing in the form of remonstrance, however respectful, or even of discussion, however candid, is prone to be met. But that this sensitiveness should be so intense in the minds of Newchurchmen as to make them frown upon the attempt to canvass its merits upon pure-

ly moral grounds, we cannot well conceive ; nor will we allow ourselves, without evidence, to anticipate a sinister reception of what our pages may contain on the subject. We will not look for an entertainment of our suggestions at the hand of our brethren which would imply a secret misgiving as to the intrinsic character of the institution which they are engaged in upholding.

For ourselves, we are free to say that we regard the system of slavery, as it exists in the Southern States, as an evil of such magnitude as imperatively to appeal for a remedy to the consciences of all concerned in any way in its support and perpetuation. But while we say this we are at the same time conscious of no acerbity of spirit towards the persons of those who are engaged in upholding it. We say it in full view of all the peculiar circumstances that go to qualify the evil as far as the agency of individual supporters is concerned ; and we say it under the firm conviction of deep and merciful designs, on the part of Divine Providence, hereafter to be gloriously developed, bearing upon the destiny of the colored race—designs which will have the effect to convert their residence in this land to the most signal blessing that could have befallen them. Nevertheless we clearly perceive a great moral evil and wrong in the system, against which we are inwardly moved to lift up a voice of protest, and to bring the question home, as one of practical import to every receiver of the New Church, whether there is not something positive for him to do in effecting its removal. In thus coming before our brethren of the slave States, we should feel that we were greatly wronged if met by an ill construction of motives. We are conscious of nothing that should give offence. We have no railing accusations to bring against any. We feel the drawing of a kind and christian affection towards our brethren. We think, indeed, we see reason to fear that their spiritual states may be injured by the relation in which they stand to an evil thing. Under this impression, we come to them in a spirit of meekness, and virtually say, “Come, brethren, let us reason to-

gether of this momentous theme. Let us see whether possibly we may not suggest to you some considerations deserving of serious thought. But do not at the outset of the conference, count us your enemies because we propose it—because we wish to open our minds with fraternal freedom on a point that weighs heavily with us, and which, in our judgment, ought thus to weigh with you. If it does not, pray show us why it does not. If it does, expound to us the measures you propose to adopt to do away the evil. As we are willing and anxious to listen to you, so refuse not to lend an ear to us. Say not that it is a topic with which we have nothing to do. We all have to do with each other's spiritual welfare if we would be faithful to the law of love. We cannot properly stand aloof from our brethren and forbear to utter a word of warning if we deem them placed in circumstances of danger, and where silence would be recreancy to justice, affection and truth. 'Thou shalt not suffer sin upon thy neighbor,' is a precept of which the literal and spiritual sense are at one. Let us then in all Christian amity compare views on the subject, and see how far we hold in common, and where, and how far we diverge from each other."

It is in this spirit that we approach the subject, and we cannot but trust that our aim will be duly appreciated. Let it not be said that though denizens of the North we are incompetent to treat the theme, from ignorance of the real posture of things in the Southern States. This is a very deep-seated impression with our friends in that region. It embodies itself in the spirit of the following extract from a letter recently received from a respected N. C. brother in Virginia. "I never yet saw a Northern man who thoroughly understood the negro character—the relation of master and slave, as it exists here—the state of this population—and the difficulties which environ the whole subject. As to this matter, even intelligent and sincere men with you seem to be absolutely impenetrable." From this position we are forced to dissent. We are utterly unable to see why a

sound and unimpeachable judgment of the *morale* of slavery may not be formed by any man of ordinary intelligence, though he may never have set foot upon Southern soil, or made himself master of all the thousand-fold details of the system. And it is only in its moral aspect that we propose to consider it. Its social and political bearings we leave to others. Its character, as compared with the perfect standard of "justice, goodness, and truth," is what we would fain ascertain, and this we do not regard as an achievement requiring a previous personal contact with the system in its practical working. The fact is, there is an antecedent probability that those who have been born and bred in the midst of the system, who have always breathed its atmosphere, and who have, as it were, worn it as a garment, are *more* liable to be blinded to its essential genius than those who view it from without. But whether we understand it in all its length and breadth or not, we deem ourselves sufficiently acquainted with it to call in question some of its fundamental principles; and to this there can be no reasonable objection, provided it be done in a proper spirit.

A reply to our remarks—and perhaps more than one—may be proffered by some of our Southern, or, probably, our Northern brethren. Such a reply, written in the spirit of our own essay, we shall most readily and cordially insert. But we must be allowed to insist that it shall be a reply to our arguments and to no other—that it shall confine itself to the single point in debate, which is the absolute right or wrong of slavery, and the consequent duty of those engaged in its support. It will avail nothing to the determination of the grand question to argue ever so elaborately that the African race in this country is better off in bondage than in freedom—that in this state they are for the most part kindly treated, not overworked in health, nor neglected in sickness—that the institution is patriarchal in its character, and warranted by the *letter* of holy writ (as is also war and polygamy) and that the schemes of abolitionists are fraught with infinite

mischiefs, etc., etc. To some of this we fully assent, and therefore it is needless to dwell upon it. As to other items we might be willing to consider them on another occasion, or under a different issue, but at present they are aside of the main point, and we would not waste time or anxiety on irrelevant topics. We would simply say, as to one intimation, that we are accountable for nobody's abolition but our own, and for the genuine effects of that we are ready at any time to be responsible. We belong to no abolition society or clique, nor do we speak in the name of any. Our sentiments on the subject flow directly from our views of the great principles of rectitude and truth, and as to who may agree or disagree with us—this is a matter of indifference.

The true tone and temper in which we think the subject ought to be broached is well set forth by Mr. De Charms in his valuable pamphlet on Freedom and Slavery : — “The wise and proper course is to reason with our brethren in true political love—to show them, if we can, their error in kindness ; and by convincing their reason, so act upon their own wills as to get them to work themselves in freely and rationally putting off an acknowledged evil.” We are not conscious of being governed by any other spirit in dealing with the subject in our pages. Nor do we deem ourselves justly liable to the charge of undue assumption on the score of virtue or sanctity, in thus proffering our sentiments to our brethren. We are deeply sensible of our evils and infirmities in many respects, but we humbly aim to put them away when discovered, and we do not find a complete exemption from defects in ourselves required as a pre-requisite to the duty of pointing out, in brotherly kindness, the defects of others.

Our first intention was to have penned a formal article, or series of articles, on the subject, discussing it exclusively on its moral grounds. Meantime the ensuing “Aphorisms” were proffered for publication, and we have concluded to make them a text for a series of comments in which our leading views on the general topic will appear.

## I.

Slavery, in all states where it exists, is a public or national evil. This is plain from its origin in the Slave-trade, which is now universally condemned—from the fact that it deprives men of various natural rights—and from several unhappy consequences resulting from it.

This is, doubtless, very sound as far as it goes, but we should have given more extension to the evil. It is not only a “public or national,” but a private or personal evil, inasmuch as it is sustained by individual agency. The habit of contemplating it mainly as a “public or national” evil, is apt to induce an obliviousness of its *moral* features which have especial relation to the will of the individual slaveholder. It is usually of but little account for men to acknowledge the existence of public or national evils, so long as they lose sight of the quota which they, each in their individual capacity, contribute to their existence or continuance. The slavery which exists in any slave State is the slavery which has been established in legal form by the collective will of the people of that State, and no one can blink the share of responsibility which fairly pertains to him as an upholder of the laws which uphold slavery. It is on the ground of this responsibility that the intelligent abolitionist of the North appeals to his Southern brother. He would kindly admonish him of the fallacy of the attempt to stave off the demands of duty under the plea that the system is the creature of the State, and that until the laws of the State are repealed, his aim is powerless to attempt any thing towards its removal. But in matters of moral moment the voice of duty is direct to the *man* rather than to the *citizen*. The *man* stands in this respect alone before God, and has no counsel to take with flesh and blood. The only point to be settled is whether any enactment, usage, or institution is intrinsically evil, and whether we, as individuals, have any agency in maintaining it. Let these two things be established, and the sequence is inevitable, that a man is solemnly

bound to ignore, withdraw, repudiate, and abnegate that agency which he may previously have had in sustaining the system. In what precise way this is to be done, we shall venture to suggest in the sequel.

## II.

The State in which slavery exists cannot plead, in excuse of this evil, the good results which may be shown to attend the institution, such as the civilizing and christianizing of the Africans, &c. Every evil committed by man has similar good results educed from it by the Divine Providence, and might be excused on this ground.

Here again the individual is merged in the State. Why could not the writer have said: "*He* who holds his fellow-man in bondage cannot plead, in excuse of this evil, the good results which may be shown to attend the institution," &c. With this modification we accept and endorse the aphorism in all cordiality. The principle here embodied is one to which we would especially invite the attention of Southern Newchurchmen. It touches the point where, if we mistake not, they are extremely liable to settle down in a fallacious view of the doctrine of the Divine Providence. We cannot indeed easily conceive that an intelligent Newchurchman should seriously and of set purpose make the providential permission of an evil a plea for contented acquiescence in it, yet when the current of self-interest runs strongly in that direction, there is doubtless danger of the *practical* adoption of such a plea. "If the Divine Wisdom and love tolerates such and such evils, why should not we," is a language which the heart may utter when the lips would shudder to pronounce it. But surely the *permissions* of the Divine Providence can never be fairly construed into a sanction of the reason, or a *quietus* of the conscience, that is concerned with them. The position of the aphorism, however, is so clear and express on this head as to preclude the necessity of reiteration or enforcement from us.

## III.

Slavery is imputable as a sin in a threefold manner ; first, to those who are actually slave-holders ; secondly, to those who favor and uphold it socially ; thirdly, to those who favor and uphold it politically. Every one is in fault according to the degree in which, besides being the holder of slaves, he asserts and defends the institution.

So far as slavery is a sin, it can scarcely be said to be imputable in more than one manner, though it may be imputed to different classes and in different degrees. This, we presume, is the writer's meaning, and with a more exact specification of the first class we should not probably dissent from it. But on this whole subject the nicest distinctions are imperatively required. "Slavery is not imputable as a sin to those who are actually slave-holders." Yet in a subsequent aphorism, the writer says, "Hence one may be a slave-holder, and yet be fully exculpated from any share in the evil ;" and in that which immediately follows we read that, "they have *not* slavery imputed to them who acknowledge it to be an evil, and act for its removal." It is evident, therefore, that the phrase "actual slave-holders" requires explication, as the character of the slave-*holding* can never be satisfactorily determined apart from the *animus* of the slave-*holder* in sustaining the relation. Doubtless, circumstances may exist which shall essentially change the character of that relation. Take, for instance, the case of one (would that their number were increased a thousand fold !) who has hitherto been a holder of slaves, but who has—no matter how—become convinced that the relation, *in the light in which he has all along viewed it*, and in which it is generally viewed, is one which cannot be sustained without sin, and who, under the force of this conviction, is sincerely and deeply desirous of extricating himself from that relation, and of retrieving the wrong which he may have done to a fellow-creature, or, at least, to the spirit of justice,—shall we say that his retaining his bond-men, in this state of mind, is necessarily and



*per se* a sin? Surely, if the man is honest in his convictions, and this we suppose, he will not rest without efforts to release himself from the dilemma in which he is placed, and he will not feel at liberty to retain in his possession this species of property, so-called, any longer than the embarrassments of his condition and a regard to *their* best good will allow. He will look upon the relation as a merely temporary one, which he is willing at any time to dissolve, as soon as he sees clearly what the Lord, speaking in his "royal law" of charity, would have him to do. It must be obvious that, so long as one remains in this transition state, holding his slaves in trust and not in fee, he comes not into the same category with the self-satisfied, unquestioning, unreflecting slave-master, ruling as by a divine right. The distinction is evidently an important one, and one that required to be clearly made in the aphorism, as the position will not hold good, unless by actual "slave-holders" the author has in his eye those who have no scruples on the subject, who never interrogate themselves, or permit the interrogations of others, in respect to the moral aspects of the relation. In reference to persons of this description the position is, doubtless, sound; and though we are not disposed to make much of the distinction between those who uphold the institution "socially," and those who uphold it "politically," yet we freely assent to the general purport of the aphorism. While, however, we believe that "slavery is imputable as a sin to those who are actually slave-holders," in the sense above defined, we do not, at the same time, forget that much charitable allowance is to be made for those who have had the system transmitted to them from their fathers, who have been born and nurtured under its influence, and who have seldom or never heard it called in question. The dictates of a genuine charity will not permit us to lose sight of whatever extenuating circumstances may be cited in connection with any particular form of evil. On this head we acknowledge all the force of Dr. Channing's masterly appeal in his "Letter to the Abolitionists."

“ As an example of the unjust severity which I blame, it may be stated that some among you have been accustomed to denounce slaveholders as ‘robbers and man-stealers.’ Now, robbery and stealing are words of plain signification. They imply that a man takes *consciously* and *with knowledge* what belongs to another. To steal is to seize privily; to rob is to seize by force the *acknowledged* property of one’s neighbor. Now, is the slaveholder to be charged with these crimes? Does he *know* that the slave he holds is not his own? On the contrary, is there any part of his property to which he thinks himself to have a stronger right? I grant that the delusion is a monstrous one. I repel with horror the claim of ownership of a human being. I can as easily think of owning an angel as of owning a man. But do we not know that there are men at the North, who, regarding the statute-book as of equal authority with the Sermon on the Mount, and looking on legal as synonymous with moral right, believe that the civil law can create property in a man as easily as a brute, and who, were they consistent, would think themselves authorized to put their parents under the lash, should the legislature decree, that at a certain age, the parent should become the slave of the child? Is it wonderful, then, that men, brought up in sight of enslaved human beings, in the habit of treating them as chattels, and amidst laws, religious teachings, and a great variety of institutions, which recognize this horrible claim, should seriously think themselves the owners of their fellow-creatures! We are sure that they do view the slave as property; and thus viewing him, they are no more guilty of robbing and stealing, than one of you would be, who, by misapprehension, should appropriate to himself what belongs to another. And are we authorized to say that there are none at the South, who, if they should discover their misapprehension, would choose to impoverish themselves, rather than live by robbery and crime? Are all hearts open to our inspection? Has God assigned to us his prerogative of judgment? Is it not a violation of the laws of Christian

charity, to charge on men, whose general deportment shows a sense of justice, such flagrant crimes as robbery and theft? It is said that, by such allowances to the master, I have weakened the power of what I have written against slavery; that I have furnished a pillow for the conscience of the slaveholder. But truth is truth, and we must never wink it out of sight for the sake of effect. God needs not the help of our sophistry or exaggeration. For the sake of awakening sensibility, we must not, in our descriptions, add the weight of a feather to the sufferings of the slave, or the faintest shade to the guilt of the master. Slavery indeed, regarded as a violation of man's most sacred rights, should always be spoken of by us with the deepest abhorrence; and we ought not to conceal our fear, that, among those who vindicate it in this free and Christian land, there must be many who wilfully shut their eyes on its wrongs, who are victims of a voluntary blindness, as criminal as known and chosen transgression. Let us speak the truth, and the whole truth, and speak it in the language of strong conviction. But let neither policy nor passion carry us beyond the truth. Let a severe principle of duty, stronger than excitement, watch and preside over all our utterance."

In this relation we cannot refrain from alluding to a paragraph in Mr. De Charms' generally excellent "Views of Freedom and Slavery, in the Light of the New Jerusalem." In this pamphlet he argues very conclusively that African slavery is a civil, political, moral, and spiritual evil; while, at the same time, he holds that in our Southern States it may not be a *sin*, but is rather to be regarded as a chronic constitutional disease, which entitles our Southern brethren to our kind consideration, and imposes on us the duty of co-operation with them in gradually getting rid of it as an hereditary evil. That this proposition is not devoid of truth we are free to admit; while, at the same time, we are forced to regard it as a truth, so much diluted by the excusatory elements with which it is mixed, as very seriously to prevent any

erosive effect that it might otherwise have upon the consciences of those for whom it was, or at least ought to have been, intended. The naked proposition that slavery *may not* be a sin with our Southern brethren, leaves the matter very much at loose ends, so long as there is no specification of cases and conditions that shall throw light upon the casuistry of the subject. The position may be easily offset by the counter assertion that slavery *may be* a sin with slaveholders as well as an evil, and what advance is made towards a practical view of the truth unless the due discriminations are made, and the parties aided in settling the question for themselves in what cases it is a sin, and in what not? On this head we consider the essay somewhat defective, for we do not perceive that Mr. De Charms' reasoning meets the demands of an awakened conscience, or would be very apt to awaken a sleeping one. We were, in fact, rather surprised to find no more than four pages of the whole work devoted to this particular point, which evidently requires the most elaborate and thorough-going discussion. The substance of his argument on this head is contained in the following paragraph :

"Slavery, though undoubtedly an evil, may not, in all cases, be a sin. Or, if a sin, may be one which the apostle deems 'not unto death;' but which may be 'prayed for.' The apostle declares 'all unrighteousness is sin;' that is, sin consists in all transgression of the divine laws. But, says he, 'there is a sin not unto death.' Doubtless the sin which is unto death is voluntary sin; and that which is not unto death is involuntary. The sin of ignorance is involuntary sin. So is the sin of hereditary transmission, so far as it does not become actual evil by one's own irrational volition. Still, both these kinds of involuntary sin, although not unto death, must occasion to the committer of them some degree of penalty. 'The Lord,' says the doctrine of our church, 'requires no more of a man than that he should do according to what he *knows* to be true.' The same doctrine is taught by our church in this form: 'Those who know their duty, and not those who are ignorant of it, are the objects of imputation, whether it be of righteousness or of guilt; just as blind men, when they stumble, are no objects of blame; for the Lord says—"If ye were blind, ye would have no sin; but now you say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth," John ix. 41.' (U. T. 127.) Hence the condemnation and fatality of all sin lie in a man's knowing what is true, and yet willing and acting contrary to it—in 'loving darkness rather than light, because his deeds are evil.' So

that if a man 'knows his Lord's will, and does things worthy of stripes, he shall be beaten with *many* stripes.' But, if he 'knows not his Lord's will, and yet does things worthy of stripes, he shall be beaten with *few* stripes.' In both cases a penalty is inflicted; but in the former a heavy, and in the latter a light one. Hence, if slavery be an evil, all who are implicated in it—even those who are innocently implicated—must suffer in some degree from it. But those who do not know, or believe, it to be wrong, are not condemnable on account of it *as sin*. Neither are those guilty sinners who have had slavery entailed on them by hereditary transmission. Yet to those who do know, or believe, it to be sinful, the implication of it is indeed a heinous offence both against God and man. For surely not one can doubt that, while voluntary service, or the service of love and therefore of freedom, is supernal, forced service, or that service which fear renders to imperious masterdom, is infernal.

"Now, we cannot believe that slavery in our Southern States is heinously sinful. We do indeed believe it is an evil; but we hold it to be an evil mercifully permitted, in the divine restorative economy, for an ultimate or final good. What that is, we shall see as we proceed. Or, if Southern slavery be a sin, we are sure it is not one that is unto death. It is a venial transmitted sin. The institution of slavery was entailed upon the Southern States by the mother country's cupidity. Hence we regard it there in the light of an hereditary evil, which requires much love and wisdom—great prudence, care, patience, and tender solicitude—in its eradication. It must be regarded as a politically constitutional disease, which can be cured only by time, wise political dietetics, and intelligent skill, exciting the body politic's recuperative energies. All nature is as abhorrent to sudden change as to a vacuum. And the sin of slavery sinks into absolute insignificance in comparison with the egregious sin of those political or morbidly philanthropic quacks, who, by their *heroic* treatment of this disease—by their sudden alteratives, their decided blood-lettings, their drastic purges, their violent counter-irritants, and their other *strong* remedies—would either kill the patient, or inflict upon his shattered constitution vastly greater and more incurable factitious diseases, if, by some merciful providential fortuity, he should happen to get well in spite of their physic! No true man will be *forced* to do even what is right. And the very worst effect of all oburgatory and even seeming compulsory efforts to destroy the evil of slavery in the South as a damning sin, has been the driving of our Southern brethren into the justification of it as a divine institution, and a positive good. Thus do extremes beget extremes."

The distinction between sins of ignorance and sins of knowledge is certainly well founded; but when the author, with a mere whisper of a qualification, puts "the sin of hereditary transmission" into the same category with sins of ignorance, we feel that he disregards a point

of the utmost moment to a just estimate of the *morale* of the subject. "Those who do not know or believe it (slavery) to be wrong, are not condemnable on account of it *as sin*. Neither are those guilty sinners who have had slavery entailed on them by hereditary transmission." They are not of course made guilty by the simple fact of the entailment; but it is doing great injustice to truth to omit to state most clearly under what circumstances guilt is incurred in such cases. True, we find in a previous sentence a few words of qualification—"The sin of ignorance is involuntary sin. So is the sin of hereditary transmission, so far as it does not become actual evil of one's own irrational volition." This is every syllable that we find in the pamphlet tending to qualify a position which will be very certain to operate as an opiate to the conscience unless guarded by the most explicit statement of qualifications and exceptions. We will, therefore, supply the omission by citing an authority which Mr. De Charms is not prone to undervalue—"No one ever suffers punishment in another life on account of hereditary evil, because it is not his, consequently he is not blamable for it; but he suffers punishment on account of actual evil which is his; *so also as by actual life he has appropriated to himself hereditary evil.*"—*A. C.* 2308. This puts the matter upon the right basis; and our southern friends can avail themselves justly of the above concessions only so far as they are conscious of this non-appropriation of the evil inheritance bequeathed them by their fathers. But on this score we regret to say that we perceive very, very little evidence that the Southern people, as a body, give any indications of a state of mind similar to that which elicited the encomiums of an apostle—"For behold this self-same thing, that ye sorrowed, after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what cleaning of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge! In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter." We fear that the principal *gravamen* of the wrong-doing

chargeable upon slave-holders is a refusal to recede from the ways in which their progenitors have walked—a resolute closing of the eyes against the light that would fain visit them—a persistent repellency put forth towards every appeal, however kindly and well meant, addressed to their rational and religious principles—a perpetual process of self-justification—a proneness to resent and treat as impertinent every suggestion implying that a sacred moral duty rests upon every holder of slaves to investigate candidly and thoroughly the genius of the institution, and solemnly to repudiate whatever element there is in it of offence towards God, and of injury towards men. However we may grant that an intemperate and Ishmaelitic zeal may in some cases have characterized the warfare that has been waged against slavery, still even such a spirit in assailants does not nullify the moral potency of the truths which they utter or write, nor warrant the turning a deaf ear to all protestation and admonition addressed by conscious philanthropy to apprehended oppression, which the men of the south are apt to evince. There is truly such a thing as an unexceptionable end in the appeals of christian men in the free States to their brethren in the slave States. There is such a thing as a genuinely benevolent concern for the spiritual weal of the parties invoked, and which, in the sight of Heaven, is entitled to a kindly and courteous entertainment. Such appeals may appear harsh, simply because they probe deep; but, “faithful are the wounds of a friend.” They have for their aim the breaking up of the false calm of a passive, inert, and consenting acquiescence in a state of things which, beyond all question, and notwithstanding all Divine permission, involves a gross moral evil that imperiously demands a remedy.

## IV.

They have *not* slavery imputed to them, who acknowledge it to be an evil, and act for the removal of it, socially and politically, according to the laws of order. This is plain from the analogy of the individual

man, to whom, in the course of reformation and regeneration, his evils are not imputed.

We fear that there are those even in the bounds of the New Church who will be very backward to accept the salvo so kindly provided for them in the above aphorism. The non-imputation of slavery as an evil will doubtless be thought very lightly of by those who acknowledge no evil at all in the system. However much of surprise it may occasion, yet the fact is unquestionable, that a considerable portion of the Southern population, and among them many Newchurchmen, strenuously maintain that slavery is neither a civil, political, or moral evil, and, in fact, that the term *evil* is in no sense predicable of it, viewed in its essential character. There may be evils of abuse in the practical carrying out of the system, but none in its intrinsic genius. To what extent this view of it is held by Southern N. C. receivers, we are ignorant; but we find it unequivocally avowed in some of the communications addressed to us from that quarter, and a Southern paper of late date embodies, no doubt, a large amount of sectional sentiment in the following assertion: "If slavery cannot be defended on the grounds of its abstract justice, it can have no defence at all worthy of note; and no good man can give it defence." We can easily discern the process by which the South is driven to this ultra position, but to us, we are free to say, this has very much the air of *a false from evil*—of the confirmation of an utterly false principle from the blinding effect of a selfish love. What is the essential genius of slavery? Is it not the claim of the right of property in a human being? How was this right acquired? Was there no evil in the original acquisition? Was it not effected by lawless might over resisting but powerless weakness? Was not this *all* the title which could be pleaded in the first instance for the asserted right? Has the basis of this right subsequently changed its nature? Is the right of the possession any different from the right of the acquisition? If there was an evil in the circum-



stances in which the black man originally came into the hands of the white man, how and when was that element eliminated from the relation? In the light of the New Dispensation do we not learn that the laws of charity are the standard of evil? Does charity give its *imprimatur* to the brand which proclaims a human being transformed from a freeman to a slave? If the law of charity did not preside at the first act, how could it preside at any succeeding act of the *mancipating* process? On this head we have never seen any specimen of slaveholding logic that was not in our view essentially defective. May we ask to be informed how the invasion of the native freedom of a human being, and his reduction to bondage against his will, is not a breach of charity; and if a breach of charity, how it is not an evil; and if it was an evil in the outset, how it ceases to be an evil in the sequel. That the result is so overruled in the issue as to be a blessing to the enslaved, we do not question for a moment; but was this the *motive* of the original slave-captors on the coast of Africa? Has any one the hardihood to assert it? If it were not, how could the act be devoid of evil? And how can the whole train of sequences, which takes its character from the initiatory step, fail to be tainted with the same vice?

What shall be said to the argument involved in the following paragraph?

"It were humiliating to set about the *proof* that the slave system is incompatible with Christianity; because no man questions its incompatibility who knows what Christianity is, and what it requires. . . . Look at the foundation of all the relative duties of man—Benevolence, Love—that love and benevolence which is the fulfilling of the moral law—that 'charity' which prompts to acts of kindness, and tenderness, and fellow-feeling for all men. Does he who seizes a person in Guinea, and drags him shrieking to a vessel, practice this benevolence? When three or four hundreds have been thus seized, does he who chains them together in a suffocating hold, practice this benevolence? When they have reached another shore, does he who gives money to the first for his victims, keeps them as his property, and compels them to labor for his profit, practice this benevolence? Would either of these persons think, if their relative situations were exchanged with the Africans', that the

Africans used them justly and kindly? No. Then the question is decided. Christianity condemns the system; and no further inquiry about rectitude remains. The question is as distinctly settled as when a man commits a burglary it is distinctly certain that he has violated the law."—*Dymond's Essays*, p. 507.

The truth is, we feel reluctant to assume an argumentative attitude towards this position. It is giving it too much significance. The instinct of charity perceives itself instantaneously revolted by the assertion that it is not an evil to deprive a man of his freedom, and to consign him and his posterity to perpetual bondage. It is a position that no reasoning can legitimate, and one that really damages the cause it is intended to support. Far better would it be for the South to confess the original evil and wrong, and to plant their defence on the ground of its unsolicited and deplored transmission from the men of another generation—an inheritance bringing with it a world of embarrassment as to the true path of duty, as to which, however, they are far, very far, from indifferent, and if they appear to be tardy in action, that is owing to the practical difficulties which beset every attempt to apply the proper remedy. Now, these difficulties, we shall endeavor to show, are by no means insuperable, but they are still difficulties, and the South are at full liberty to plead them in reply to the rampant urgency of a zeal of reform which is not according to knowledge. We look upon it as peculiarly unfortunate that the Southern defenders of the institution allow themselves to be driven, by the stress of anti-slavery logic, to so flimsy a retreat as that of the intrinsic harmlessness of the central principle of the system. This ground, we believe, was seldom or never taken in the earlier days of slavery, nor do we think it would ever have been resorted to, but for the vigorous onset made by the anti-slavery sentiment of the North. An evil hard pressed is very prone to betake itself to a falsity for refuge. For ourselves, therefore, we are disposed to take it for granted that there is, in fact, a latent consciousness of an intrinsic evil adhering to the system, and not

only so, but that this feature of it is a source of earnest and anxious thought with conscientious men of the South, who find themselves sustaining the relation, and who would devoutly desire to acquit themselves to the approbation of the Searcher of hearts. To all such the proposition of the aphorism will not have the air of a gratuitous moralizing. They will respectfully consider the laws which govern the Divine estimate of evil, and they will agree with us that the acknowledgment on this score which shall secure the non-imputation of slavery as a sin, must needs be something more than a mere general, lax, or matter of course assenting to the proposition which affirms it as an evil. A man may make his verbal acknowledgment, while at the same time he loses sight of his own agency in the matter, and thinks of it solely as an evil predicable of the community at large. Nay, he may even, while inwardly favoring it in his heart, practise a certain *ruse* upon his conscience by such an acknowledgment, and secretly fancy that he atones for the evil by confessing it. But, plainly, such an acknowledgment amounts to nothing. It must be a sincere, thorough-going recognition of one's own personal agency in upholding the system, coupled with a course of positive action tending directly, however gradually, to do away what he professes to deplore. This is doubtless implied in the words of the Aphorism, but it may be well to reiterate it, as the subtlety of the corrupt heart of man is such that he will even make the testimony which his moral nature compels him to bear to right, a cloak for the persistent continuance in the very wrong which he would fain persuade himself he abhors.

The remaining clause of the Aphorism undoubtedly sets forth an analogy pertinent to the case before us, and one which is strongly confirmatory of the ground we have assumed above. In individual regeneration the great desideratum is conscious sincerity, simplicity, and honesty of aim. When this is present, and the soul is pressing on to high and pure attainments, the evils of which it is struggling to divest itself are not imputed to

it, nor can they prevent a final felicitous issue. So in the case before us. If the slaveholder gives moral principle fair play, and truly and sincerely labors to ascertain what the Lord would have him to do in the circumstances, and is willing to go counter to his apparent worldly interest, and make sacrifices for the sake of truth and righteousness, then he may assure himself that the evil he may have formerly countenanced is not imputed to him, and he may present an unruffled brow to all reproaches and vilifications. But men thus prompted will not take it ill to be reminded that subtleties and sophistries, the offspring of a perverted proprium, will scarcely fail to cloud their perceptions, and warp their judgment, when they come to grapple in earnest with the problem that presses upon them.

## V.

One law of Divine order is, that evils must not be removed suddenly, and that if the attempt be made, worse evils arise. The law applies to public or national evils, as well as to those of the individual.

We question not that a very important truth is embodied in this paragraph, albeit we should have preferred the phraseology which we see from the manuscript was originally adopted—"that evils *cannot* be removed suddenly." Language implying *prohibition* in regard to the sudden removal of evil, is stronger than the nature of the case admits, and is calculated to lead to wrong impressions. At any rate we do not find this language countenanced by Swedenborg, as his phraseology is very uniformly *cannot* instead of *must not*. This will appear from a few paragraphs which we insert, and to which we give place the more readily from the fact that they develop the philosophy of the principle in a very beautiful and striking manner. "Man is not hastily but slowly regenerated; because all things which he had thought, had intended, and done from infancy, have added themselves to his life, and have made it, and also have formed such a connexion amongst each other, that one cannot

be moved away unless all are moved away together with it. Hence, it is evident that evils and falses with an evil man, *cannot* be removed suddenly, but so far as goods and truths are implanted in their order and interiorly, for heaven removes hell from man. If this was to be suddenly, the man would be defective, for all and singular things which are in connexion and form would be disturbed, and violence would be done to his life.”—(A. C. 9334.) “Goods and truths should remove evils and falses by successive implantations; for falses are not removable except by truths, nor evils except by goods; if this is not done successively and according to order, the falses which favor those loves flow in, and from the delight of those loves the man concludes nothing but falses, if the falses of evil are suddenly removed.”—(A. C. 9335.) “Man, when he is born, as to hereditary evils is a hell in the least form; hence it is that the order of his life from nativity and from actual life is opposite to the order of heaven. The former life, therefore, which is of hell, must be altogether destroyed, that is, evils and falses must be removed, to the intent that new life, which is the life of heaven, may be implanted. This *cannot* in anywise be done hastily; for every evil being inrooted with its falses, has connection with all evils and their falses; and such evils and falses are innumerable, and their connection is so manifold that it cannot be comprehended, not even by the angels, but only by the Lord; hence it is evident that the life of hell with man *cannot* be destroyed suddenly, for if suddenly, he would altogether expire: and that neither can the life of heaven be implanted suddenly, for if suddenly, he would also expire.”—(A. C. 9336.) This, then, develops the general law of procedure in regard to the removal of evils; but it evidently requires great caution to guard against the perversion of the principle. It is perverted if we make use of it as a plea to countenance the continuance of any *positive act*, or series of acts, of evil, when their true character is made known to us. Every such act is to be at once renounced, and we are to enter upon

a course of reformation *as if* the final effect would immediately follow, whereas we know it will not, for the evil love which has originated the evil acts will be certain to survive for some time after the acts have ceased. Nevertheless, it is our bounden duty to *commence* at once that course of action which will result in the *final abolition* of every form of evil, leaving it to the operation of the laws of Providence to extinguish in due time the inward prompting to everything that is amiss. The fact is, the language of Swedenborg on this head is not so much to suggest a *rule of duty* for us as a *law of Providence*, founded upon the constitution of things. It is rather a declaration of what the *laws of order* imply, than of a *course of action* by which we are to be guided. The intemperate man, for instance, who sees the evil of indulgence, is bound at once to abandon his cups, though he does it under the moral certainty that the appetite may remain to trouble him for a long time to come. But on this head he is not required to be very solicitous. This part of the consequences will take care of itself. Let the drinking cease, and the thirst will gradually die away. "Where no wood is, the fire goeth out." So in the case before us. There is undoubtedly *something* which is *immediately* incumbent upon the conscientious slaveholder, while at the same time we are fully persuaded there are some steps bearing on the final issue which are *not* at once to be taken, as it would be a rash precipitating of dangerous results, and contrary to the order of Providence. What is at once to be done, and what to be temporarily forborne in the premises, will appear as we proceed. We do not differ from A. E. F. as to the fact of the providential law to which he refers, as the sequel will show, but we fear that the language of *inhibition* which he employs may lead to wrong inferences, and paralyze that measure and form of effort which is called for by the principles of charity without the least delay.

## VI.

This law is violated with less impunity, in proportion as the evil to

be removed is more interior. The sign that a public or national evil is interior is, that it is recognized, sanctioned, and established *by the laws*. Thus, intemperance is a less interior evil than slavery, because though it prevails, it is not, or not to the same degree, sanctioned by law.

The "law" here spoken of is that which forms the subject of the preceding aphorism, to wit: "that evils must not be removed suddenly." We have endeavored to show that this is not so much to be viewed as a prohibitory precept by which our duty is to be determined, as the statement of a fact or a principle which obtains in the regenerating process as governed by the laws of order, and is therefore not so much a *law liable to be violated*, as a principle *liable to be disregarded*, and this it no doubt may be, much to the injury of great moral interests. This injury, the writer thinks, will be apt to be greater in proportion as an evil is more interior, or, in other words, more deeply and organically inwrought in the usages, institutes, and legal enactments of any community. Consequently, he would deprecate the sudden breaking up of the system, as by law established, lest still more pernicious results might ensue, a general view of the subject which we deem correct. An abrupt and violent rending away, however, of this feature of the civil code, is one thing, and a calm, deliberate, but still immediate inchoation of measures that shall eventually bring about that issue is another. We see nothing that stands in the way of conscience or wisdom in the resolve to enter *at once* upon the incipency of an emancipating process, and when this is done in earnest, we have no fears that the right result will not follow. This we conceive to be the legitimate course in all cases of acknowledged evil, whether interior or exterior. Assuredly, if men are involved in the support of such an evil, and have their eyes open to the fact, and are with all anxious to free themselves from it, there must be *some* way of extrication, for it is inconceivable that any man, or any class of men, should be shut up by the insuperable bars of the Divine Providence to the necessity of continuing in such

a predicament. There must be some "outgate" for him who would escape. An irrevocable necessity of wrongdoing can be imposed upon no man in this world. If any law, usage, or institution be intrinsically wrong, it cannot be right to continue it; consequently, with those who have been its abettors, there is of necessity *some* duty of renunciation incumbent as soon as they are convinced of the evil of their agency, past or present, in sustaining it. Nor is any individual exempted from this duty, because he is associated by civil or religious ties with others who do not sympathize with him in his convictions, and who therefore withhold co-operation. He has some share in the general action of the collective body in perpetuating the evil, and this share he is bound to renounce, and to labor by protest and moral suasion to bring his associates to unite with him in sentiment and action, with a view to its final abrogation. Upon this point it is hardly possible to insist too urgently, that the individual is never at liberty so far to merge himself in the state as to forbear acting in the redress of evils till the state itself takes the initiative. The demands of an enlightened conscience press themselves directly upon the man as responsible first of all to the "higher law" of his God, irrespective of his relations to the state, and call upon him to renounce and abjure that measure of agency which may pertain to him as an originator or continuator of the legalized system of wrong which is brought into question.

It is in our view all important that in urging the claims of abolitionism upon Southern slaveholders we should plant ourselves distinctly upon this ground. Our appeal should be made to the individual rather than to the community. The community cannot be expected to act as a community till the component members are individually convinced of their duty in the premises. The units are prone to hide themselves in the aggregate, as did Saul among the "stuff," but when drawn out each one will scarcely fail to be conscious that on the score of moral responsibility, he is "from the shoulders and up-



wards," at least as high as "any of the people." This responsibility he can by no means evade; but in what particular form it is to be exercised, and under what special qualifications the slaveholder is to heed the summons to emancipation, will be more fully considered in what follows.

## VII.

By the two preceding aphorisms an *immediate emancipation* of slaves is so far from being the true remedy of the evil, and a duty imposed by the Christian religion, that it is a false remedy forbidden by Christianity.

This surely is very strong language, nor are we by any means prepared to assent to it without a close inspection of its purport. Yet, as in nearly every one of the aphorisms, so in this likewise, we recognize a substratum of truth which we are not at all disposed to question, but a truth that needs, in our view, to undergo somewhat of a process of logical smelting in order to bring out the pure metal freed from all vicious adherences. It will not, we presume, be denied that in every case of moral wrong there is an opposite and corresponding right. If slavery, i. e., slaveholding, as generally defined and practised, be in reality a wrong done to the neighbor, then if we can ascertain the act or conduct which is precisely the reverse of this, we may doubtless take it for granted that we have hit upon the requisite right which is the true remedy for the wrong in question. If a certain disease is to be cured, and there is a particular medicine which is a genuine specific for that disease, that surely is the medicine which should be administered to the patient. Let us apply this principle in the present case. The two terms, *mancipation* (from *manu*, and *capio*, *taking with the hand*) and *e-mancipation*, imply ideas directly the converse of each other, the one denoting the act of reducing to bondage, the other the act of freeing from bondage. Now, surely, if the former term denotes an act which is intrinsically wrong, and the latter an act directly contrary to it, and therefore intrinsically right,

there can be no doubt that *emancipation* is the true remedy for its opposite evil, and consequently, that this is precisely the remedy which Christianity enjoins. Are not the two things just as obversely opposite to each other as *theft* and *restitution*; and does Christianity prescribe to the conscience any other remedy for theft than restitution, accompanied by repentance?

But the aphorism before us points its censure, not at emancipation in the abstract, but at *immediate* emancipation; and this it professes to regard as a false and forbidden remedy for an incontestable evil. This then becomes the grand question in debate, and we venture to say that this can never be satisfactorily settled, without first settling clearly and distinctly the true idea of the essence of slavery, and of the essence of emancipation. To this end we remark, that if slavery be admitted to be in itself an evil, then there must be incumbent an immediate duty of some kind in relation to it, for no evil is to be *quietly* acquiesced in for a moment. What is that duty? What can it be, but the sincere mental renunciation of the principle which lies at the foundation of the system of involuntary slavery, to wit: *the claim of a right of property in a human being, or the right of converting a man into a chattel*. This is the radical vice—the fundamental falsity—the central wrong of the whole system. Upon a strict analysis it is precisely here—in the mental assertion of a false and injurious principle—that the essential evil of servitude concentrates itself. It is the laying claim to a right which is itself a nullity. No such right ever did or could exist. A human being can, by no rightful process, be so far *dehumanized* as to sink him to an object of ownership and an article of merchandise. The fact that such a right has been long asserted and exercised, imparts to it no validity. It is simply by a legal fiction that such possession is termed *property*, and under that denomination transmitted from father to son. In the nature of the case the title of subsequent tenure can be no other than that of original acquisition. The stream cannot rise

higher than its fountain. The slave captors in Africa could plead no title to their prey other than that of lawless violence, and a mastery too strong for its victims. Consequently, what they had not, they could not convey. We must be excused for speaking plainly on this subject, for the scope of our argument requires it. We are aiming to ascertain the point of duty on a subject which appeals with pressing urgency to the moral instincts of the conscientious man, and this point we can never reach without penetrating the intrinsic merits or demerits of the theme. Let us, then, be allowed to say, that we are for ourselves forced to subscribe to the justice of the sentiments propounded in the following extract from "Dymond's Essays on Morality."

"The distinctions which are made between the original robbery in Africa, and the purchase, the inheritance, and the 'breeding' of slaves, do not at all respect the *kind* of immorality that attaches to the whole system. They respect nothing but the *degree*. The man who wounds and robs another on the highway, is a more atrocious offender than he who plunders a hen-roost; but he is not more *truly* an offender, he is not more *certainly* a violator of the law. And so with the slave system. He who drags a wretched man from his family in Africa, is a more flagitious transgressor than he who merely compels the African to labor for his own advantage; but the transgression, the immorality is as real and certain in the one case as in the other. He who had no right to steal the African, had none to sell him. From him who is known to have no right to sell, another can have no right to buy or to possess. Sale, or gift, or legacy, imparts no right to me, because the seller, or giver, or bequeather, had none himself. The sufferer has just as valid a claim to liberty at my hands as at the hands of the ruffian who first dragged him from his home. Every hour of every day, the present possessor is guilty of injustice.\* Nor is the case altered with re-

---

\* We would here interpose a qualifying clause. We can accept the proposition as above stated only with the understanding that the possession is

spect to those who are born on a man's estate. The parents were never the landholder's property, and therefore the child is not. Nay, if the parents had been rightfully slaves, it would not justify me in making slaves of their children. No man has a right to make a child a slave but himself."

Can our position then be questioned, that as a title never possessed can never be transferred, so the slaves of the South, held as such on no other tenure than that by which they were made such, cannot be regarded as the bona fide property of their alleged owners. To a just casuistry it matters not through how many hands an usurped possession may have passed, there is no genuine title created to it *in transitu*, not even if the original owner should never appear to prefer his claim. The ethics of Christianity know of no process of *post-legitimation* which can apply to a case of this kind; and upon no other basis do we perceive how any professed defence of slavery can rest. Such a process is all along assumed by the slaveholder; and here, if we rightly conceive, is the very heart and core of the offending principle in slavery, the sincere acknowledgment and renunciation of which is the first step in the retroceding course prescribed by an enlightened conscience. How much *more* than such a mental acknowledgment and renunciation is involved in the moral demands made on this head, we shall have occasion to consider in the sequel, but surely nothing *less* will suffice in the outset.

We cannot but be aware that such an emphatic presentation of the case, in its fundamental aspects, will scarcely fail to be the reverse of agreeable to our Southern brethren; but we are at the same time confident that

---

held in the same spirit with which it was first acquired. We do not predicate a continued "injustice," in the case where the present possessor inwardly repudiates the original act in consequence of which a human being has been cast upon his hands, and where he is entirely conscious of holding him, not with a view to self-interest or from the lust of oppression, but solely with regard to the best good of the slave himself. It is the *motive* which is the all-in-all.      ceeping up the relation.

our position cannot fairly be controverted, nor do we feel at liberty to plant ourselves on any lower ground. Our *object* is to point the finger, in exact indication, to what we regard as the spot where the virulence of the disease is more especially concentrated. Our *motive* is to contribute by friendly suggestion to an effectual cure. We would be far from acting the unfeeling part of a surgeon who should lance and probe an ulcer for the sole purpose of inflicting anguish, or of convincing the patient that his body was suffering under a dangerous disease. He were a monster instead of a man if ultimate cure were not his aim.

We insist the more strenuously on the above position from the fact, that the consciousness of *intending* no injury or wrong to the slave, which we firmly believe holds good of those whom *we* presume to address, and the patriarchal and parental relation which such masters strive to sustain to their bondmen, together with a certain contented and even happy sphere which often prevails over a well-ordered plantation, strongly tends to veil from sight the underlying principles of falsity and evil which still pertain to the system under the fairest phases it may assume. Indeed, it requires with us but a purely ideal sojourn in the parlors, out-houses, and fields of such of our brethren as will probably read these pages, where we witness the governing kindness on the one hand, and the simple, childlike, obedient affection on the other, to feel the force of an indefinable spell upon us, disarming us of our prejudices, and *almost* reconciling us to the "peculiar institution," as securing, all things considered, the best condition for the benighted sons of Africa. We can, at any rate, by a mental metempsychosis, so far enter into the feelings of the better sort of Southern slave-masters as to realize the strong sphere of repellency with which they throw off the imputation of conscious wrong, injury, oppression, and cruelty that are often indiscriminately urged against them. For the time being our *emotions* side with the men who are so roughly arraigned, and *we* are disposed

also to say, "You know nothing of the actual state of things among us. Come and live with us awhile, and you will stand corrected in your verdict. You will then see how harshly you have judged us."

But not thus does our calm, deliberate Christian reason decide. We perceive that we are giving way to a subtle illusion when we would fain persuade ourselves of the innocuousness of this relation as ordinarily held. We cannot hide from ourselves the fact of a stupendous moral wrong involved in the virtual assertions which buttress the system as a whole. And as "there is no sin without a sinner," and the essence of the evil of slavery lies in the *animus* with which the relation is maintained, we cannot but urge the laying aside of that *animus*, to wit: the mental affirmation of a right which God never gave, and man could not. This is the principal to which everything else is accessory. There are a thousand adventitious evils and mischiefs which may or may not characterize the actual working of the institution, such as the ignorance, the degradation, the depravity, the licentiousness, the oppression, the cruelty, and other abominations that are prone to cluster around the parent stock of servitude. But these are accidental. The central evil, the essential enormity, which we recognize in slavery, is the claim of property in a human being; and this claim we challenge in the name of Justice, Mercy, and Charity. The undelayed renunciation of this false assumption we urge upon the man of the New Church who may be expected to heed the appeal of principles so sacred in his eyes. For, if such be the essence of slavery, what inference more legitimate than that the essence of emancipation is directly the reverse, to wit: the mental renunciation of the claim in question. The one is the direct counterpart of the other. If the one is morally interdicted, the other is morally obligatory. In thus renouncing, abnegating, and disavowing the fundamental slave axiom, *he performs that which is the essential element of emancipation.* A mental act of this nature strikes at the very root of the evil, inasmuch as

when sincere it puts an end at once to the traffic in human beings. A man who honestly renounces the falsity under consideration can neither buy nor sell, since this necessarily supposes the validity of the claim of property. This assumption we trust we have shown to be groundless, and therefore no action can properly be built upon it which would imply the contrary.

We have reached, then, if we mistake not, by a fair process, the conclusion that there *is* an *immediate* duty in the premises incumbent on the slaveholder ; one too which involves the very essence of emancipation, and that without violating any of the established laws of divine order, when those laws are rightly apprehended. It is a duty directly imperative upon the individual irrespective of any human enactments legitimating the asserted but unfounded claim of property, for no earthly statute is authorized to contravene an eternal dictate of Heaven ; nor may any legislature presume to invade the province of private conscience, and interpose a veto to any decision of the soul which is prompted by a supreme regard to the will of God. All such enactments are of course null and void *in foro conscientie*, as in fact is every ordinance of man which conflicts with the higher law of divine order.

But while we hold most strenuously to the imperative obligation of this duty, as now defined, we reject the inference which might be drawn from it, that the *immediate* disruption of all the bonds connecting master and slave must necessarily ensue. This course, we think, would be justly liable to the exceptions of our correspondent. It would be just such a precipitating of results as the principles of the New Church, based upon the laws of true order, would forbid, and here it is that a new field of argument and action opens upon us, where the dictates of human prudence, under the prompting of Christian charity, are to be heeded ; and upon this department of our subject we shall soon be prepared to enter.

## VIII.

Hence one may be a slaveholder, and yet be fully exculpated from any share in the evil, viz : on the conditions specified in No. IV., of acknowledgment and action pursuant thereto. To deplore slavery and acquiesce in it, does not excuse.

To what extent, and with what limitations, we accord with the purport of this aphorism will be easily inferred from the tenor of our preceding remarks. When it is affirmed that "one may be a slaveholder, and yet be fully exculpated from any share in the evil," the conditions under which alone this position can hold good had need be very exactly and punctiliously defined. Beyond question, the moral character of the relation of master and servant depends, as we have already more than once observed, upon the *animus* of the master in sustaining it. Our first article on the subject contains the remark, that there is an essential difference in the moral character of the relation as sustained by one who holds his slaves as *bona fide property*, and one who regards them as a *trust*, providentially thrown upon his hands, and towards which he is called to discharge a solemn duty in the spirit of the golden rule of charity, doing to his slaves as he would be done by in similar circumstances. The distinction of the two cases is all important in the present connection. It affords the only clew by which we can determine when it is that "one may be a slaveholder, and yet be fully exculpated from any share in the evil." The sole condition, in our opinion, on which this immunity from evil can be affirmed is, that he mentally renounce the fundamental principle on which the whole system rests, and in which the essential evil is involved, and then follow up this renunciation with the appropriate course of action. If this is what the author intends by the "acknowledgment" and "action pursuant thereto," specified in the aphorism, we have no great difficulty in acceding to it. But we should insist that it cover in import the entire ground of our previous definitions and explications, ere we give it our cordial assent, for we



cannot abate an iota of the stringency of our demand on the score of the *principle* to be renounced, as nothing short of this renunciation will, in our view, absolve the conscience from all participation in the evil.

The language of the aphorism referred to we will here repeat: "They have *not* slavery imputed to them, who acknowledge it to be an evil, and act for the removal of it, socially and politically, according to the laws of order." We have already conceded the merit of sound doctrine to this position, and it is because it affords so fitting a stand-point from which to urge home the appeal to conscience, that we re-adduce it. Taking it for granted that the "acknowledgment" in question involves no less than the mental abandonment of the property-claim, our next concern is to ascertain what is the *appropriate action* that the laws of charity and order prescribe in the premises. And here it is, in the answer to this question, that we stand at the dividing point between ourselves and the mass of anti-slavery men, with whose ultimate objects we fully sympathize, and whose logical argument in regard to the fundamental falsity underlying the system of American slavery, we deem absolutely impregnable. While we hold to the duty of *immediate emancipation*, as above defined, we should have abundant qualifications to specify and insist upon before admitting the duty of *immediate manumission* to be equally imperative. We have no doubt that this will be regarded by many as a virtual abandonment of the ground we have hitherto maintained; as a practical nullifying of all that we have thus far established, and the ministering of a comfortable quietus to the conscience which had perhaps begun to be hopefully disturbed. Of this every one must form his own opinion. Our concern is to follow what we conceive to be the leading of truth, and for ourselves we have but little fear of the issue with those who are fully penetrated with the conviction of the soundness of our main position in regard to the essential evil of slavery, and of the consequent duty of the immediate renunciation of that evil. In-

deed, we see *so much* involved in the mental act enjoined, that when sincerely put forth we no more hesitate to assure ourselves of the right results in the end than we do of the ripening and gathering of the harvest when the seed is sown, the soil good, and the "skyey influences" of sun and rain have been duly contributed. We are no more certain that true repentance will work true reformation, than we are that this mental state will prompt its appropriate ultimatum. The truth is, the grand point is gained when the above mentioned act takes place, for such an act is the negation of the positive wrong involved in the system ; and what is "learning to do well," but "ceasing to do evil?" If any course of conduct is justly denominated evil, and as such comes within the range of the prohibitory precepts of Heaven, what more obvious than that the very first duty of the delinquent is *to forbear the actual doing of the wrong in question*. In the case before us, the essence of the wrong-doing is not in the oppression or cruelty which may chance to be exercised towards the slave, for oppression and cruelty are exercised where slavery does not exist, but in the assertion of a claim which gives one man the absolute and unlimited control over the person, powers, and possessions of another without his consent. This claim is recognized by the laws of the slave States as a valid right, while in the eye of the Divine law it is regarded as a nullity. What then is the demand of the Divine law, but the cordial and unreserved giving up of the principle which constitutes the *gravamen* of the offence as viewed in the light of eternal truth and justice? In virtue of this fictitious claim and fancied right, men, women, and children are bought and sold like any other marketable commodities, and various wrongs inflicted which would not be but for the asserted but baseless claim of property. Now inasmuch as the sincere mental renunciation of this alleged right of ownership lays the axe directly at the root of the evil, and forbids all traffic in these human chattels, who can fail to perceive that emancipation has fairly won the day when this point of

concession has been reached? Is it possible that this can be denied without the denial of the truth of the whole train of our foregoing argument? And to the most earnest abolitionist we would put the question, whether his demand is not virtually complied with when the nature of the relation is entirely changed, and the abhorred traffic in human flesh has come to an end? For ourselves we perceive, in the mental surrender for which we plead, so immense an advance upon any thing hitherto accorded to the "genius of universal emancipation;" we see in it such a sacrifice made by self-interest to the force of moral principle, that we cannot find it in our hearts to chide the delay which would take time to breathe before proceeding to the last act of enfranchisement. That this act, however, will be performed, *if the dictate of conscience urging it be clear*, we need have no doubt when the mental stand above described has been once taken. The one step is a pledge for the other. But as this is a point requiring the greatest deliberation, and as we perceive we should ourselves hesitate on the threshold of manumission, so we can easily imagine that others may labor under the same misgiving.

It will no doubt be objected to our conclusion that it is "lame and impotent;" that it leaves things at loose ends; that it supplies an opiate to the conscience; that it paralyzes action in the premises: that it would foster that delay in the "St. Clares" of the South which would be the means of fixing multitudes of worthy "Uncle Toms" in hopeless bondage under hard masters. Consistency, it will be urged, requires that a precise and definite course of procedure should be marked out for slaveholders to pursue when they are once convinced of the paramount duty of emancipation. Manumission papers should at once be prepared, and the needed protection in this way secured. Failing this, what evidence can any man have of the sincerity of his own convictions of duty? To this we reply that undoubtedly every one is solemnly bound to put into outward act his inward sense of duty. But every one must still be left, with

prayer for Divine guidance, to the dictates of his own mind as to the most fitting *mode* of compassing the end to be attained. The decision on this head cannot be made independent of a thousand circumstances peculiar to the general system, and to the various individual cases that may occur under it. Of these, religious slaveholders themselves are the most competent judges, and it is no more than just that we should repose so much confidence in them, as to believe that, when convinced of what justice and right demand, they will act for the best in a matter in which they have the deepest conceivable interest. It is an "aphorism" as true as any we are now considering, that "where there is a will there is a way," and our reasoning proceeds here upon the supposition that there *is* a will. We may offer friendly suggestions to our brethren, but it must ever be with the consciousness of the inadequacy of our counsel to meet all the exigencies of the case. The laws, for instance, of most of the slave States, impose serious obstacles in the way of manumission, and though these laws are essentially unjust and iniquitous, and therefore are entitled to have no moral force upon the conscience, yet they constitute a fact which cannot be disregarded; they operate to restrain the bestowment of freedom very much as a high wall around an enclosure does to prevent the egress of prisoners confined within it. They cannot be left out of view without inflicting penalties and injuries both upon master and slave. The impediment here is much the same as that which the slave himself would encounter were he to ignore, as he is really at liberty to do, his master's asserted right of ownership in him. If such a claim be, as we have endeavored to show, an intrinsic nullity as it concerns the master, it is in fact equally so as it concerns the slave. If the master is bound to renounce this alleged right, the slave, who might have a similar perception of its moral invalidity, is authorized to view it in the same light. But it would be the height of folly to act on that conviction. If sufficiently enlightened, he would say with Paul, "all things are law-

ful unto me, but all things are not expedient." As we should protest against the master's suddenly sundering all the ties between himself and his slave, because he saw the non-entity of his title, so should we use the same language to the slave. There is a *providential* relation established between them which the interests of both parties require should not be at once broken up, any more than it should be sought to be made perpetual.

And here our discussion trenches upon a department of the subject which looms up to view more and more largely the nearer we approximate to it. The *providential* aspects of slavery urge themselves, with great force, upon the mind of the Newchurchman. "The man," says Swedenborg (*D. P.* 189), "who is made spiritual by the acknowledgment of God, and wise by the rejection of his *proprium*, sees the Divine Providence in the universal world, and in all and every particular thereof. If he looks at natural things he sees it; if he looks at civil things he sees it; if he looks at spiritual things he sees it; and this as well in the simultaneous as in the successive order of things—in ends, in causes, in effects, in uses, in forms, in things great and small; especially in the salvation of men." To some of these aspects we must here allude, and none the less readily because they really tell, to a degree, on the side of the question which we are in main opposing. But we profess fealty to truth, lead where it will. The doctrine of Providence comes before the man of the New Church in a light peculiar to that system of religious verities which he has embraced. Viewing it as he does, he finds his field of vision vastly enlarged; and the accumulation of new facts creates a wider area of induction than is offered to the range of most other inquirers. To him, for instance, is made known the fact that the genius of the African race is more celestial than that of any other people; and, strange as it may appear, this single fact is to him the key by which he solves the enigma of their peculiar destiny, whether adverse or auspicious. By most men the hard lot of this sable race is regarded as a mysteriously

*sovereign* dispensation of the divine wisdom; and when the epithet *sovereign* is applied to it, it is supposed, of course, to be independent of the operation of moral causes on the part of its subject, to which it can justly be referred. An end of mercy in the final issue is indeed recognized, but the inscrutable will of Heaven stands instead of all other procuring causes. But the Newchurchman is instructed by the laws of order, to look upon this stern allotment, not as arbitrarily or gratuitously inflicted, but as the legitimate effect of an adequate cause, to be sought in their own moral conditions and actings, whether past or present. That cause he is taught to recognize in a fearful apostasy, or fall from their primitive high estate. As the celestial is the highest type of humanity, a fall from that plane would of course precipitate its subjects into the lowest depths of debasement and wretchedness. In the profound depression and degradation, therefore, of the negro race, we read the evidence of a disastrous lapse from a proportionate elevation, marked vestiges of which still remain visible to the naked eye, to say nothing of the testimony which we derive on this head from Swedenborg's revelations of the African genius in the other life. In their national love of musical sounds we see a clear indication of the predominance of affection in their nature, while, in the characteristic willingness to serve, we perceive a dim reflex of that spirit, so pre-eminently heavenly, which prompts every one to be the least of all and the servant of all. This process of decline and deterioration has undoubtedly been going on from a period of the most remote antiquity, as is to be inferred from its having, in all probability, gradually wrought among its sequences a change of color—an effect to which ages would be requisite—though the utter absence of all records renders it impossible to affix anything like definite eras to their historic developments and transitions. But the grand fact of their fall, through successive generations, from a primitive state of celestial innocence and purity, to one of degradation and misery, may be rested in as an unquestionable certainty.

Now it is upon this fact that the Newchurchman perceives the grand series of providential dispensations towards the colored race to be founded. He sees that they are of a distinctly *retributive* character, while, at the same time, an ulterior end of mercy pervades them from their commencement to their consummation. Denying to these dispensations anything of a vindictive quality, we are still authorized to look upon them as an illustration of the principle enounced by Solomon: "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." With all our virtuous sympathy towards the oppressed and down-trodden sons of Africa, it is proper ever to remember that under the divine administration "the curse causeless does not come," and that their present bitter lot tells a long story of apostasy, deterioration, cruelty, crime, and vice of every form. Nothing is gained to the cause of truth by attempting to wink unwelcome facts out of sight. Of Africa as of Babylon it must be said that she is—fallen, fallen! But unlike Babylon she is not fallen beyond the hope of recovery. Africa, even in her desolation may say: "For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; yet doth God devise means that his banished be not expelled from him."

We have said that the sufferings of the black man, as originating in slavery, are *providentially retributive*. And on this head we should have a strong assurance, even if history were silent, that the very form of their sin could be read in their punishment. But history is not silent. The evidence is ample that during the lapse of centuries, the habit of war and the practice of slavery have been rife among the savage tribes of the land of Ham. War alone would seem to have been capable of rousing their inbred sluggishness to action; and when engaged in their perpetually recurring feuds and forays, it is notorious that the most infernal cruelties, crowned by cannibalism, have ever distinguished their conduct towards their captives. Out of the sixty millions which

at any given time peopled the continent of Africa it is computed that forty millions might safely be set down as the proportion reduced to a state of slavery. And this, be it remembered, is a state of things which is of no recent origin, but has been subsisting among them for many ages. It is a great mistake to imagine that it has sprung up from the contact of Europeans and the accursed cupidities of the slave trade. It may have been stimulated from this source, but long before a slave was exported from the African shore this, with its accompaniments, was the crying sin of these wretched savages, and all the more aggravated from the fact of being perpetrated by those who had once reflected most brilliantly the goods and glories of a celestial caste.

We have no hesitation, therefore, in regarding American slavery as a direct, though long-delayed, providential penalty, visited upon its victims in the way of righteous reprisal for a similar oppression of which they themselves have been guilty. Of the principle which is operative in this allotment, Swedenborg says, "It derives its origin from the Divine law of doing unto others as we would that they should do unto us. This law in heaven is the law of mutual love or charity, whence there exists what is opposite in hell, viz., that what any one does to another, the same is done to himself; not that they who are in heaven do it, but they who are in hell do it, for the retribution of retaliation exists from opposition to that law of life in heaven." Although it is in hell that this law asserts itself most conspicuously, yet it is a law that obtains also in the present life.

It will be of course the grossest perversion to construe this train of remark into a justification of the agency by which the negro has been reduced to bondage, notwithstanding it is thus that the ends of heaven are effected. The Lord "shaves by an hired razor," and neither axe, saw, nor rod are to boast themselves against Him that wieldeth them. After making "the Assyrian the rod of his anger and the staff of his indignation," and giving him a "charge to take the spoil, and take the prey, and



to tread down like the mire of the streets," he can still justly "punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks, for in his heart he meaneth not so." And the meaning or intention is what determines the character of acts.

The scope of what we have thus far adduced on this head is simply to show, that over, beyond, and beneath all human counsels and aims in this matter, the Lord has his own penal and yet merciful ends to accomplish, and that to these ends it is not needful that the man of the New Church, whether a slaveholder or not, should be blind. Although, as a general principle, we learn that man does not manifestly perceive and feel the operation of the Divine Providence, yet when one's interior state is in accordance with the divine will, and he is thus in sympathy with its ultimate ends, we see not that he is forbidden to look into those ends, or incapacitated from yielding them an intelligent and cordial co-operation. The great question in fact for a well-principled slaveholder, who is favored with the light of the New Jerusalem, is to determine how he shall fall in with the "stream of Providence," as it regards its benignant ends towards the slave, while at the same time he is to be perfectly faithful to the monitions of his own personal conscience, uttering its dicta of absolute right unswerved by selfish interests.

What shall we say then of the ulterior practical duty of the slave-master over and beyond the mental disowning of the fundamental principle of the system on which we have hitherto insisted? For ourselves we see not how the question is to be answered, except in full view of the considerations following, some of which we have already adverted to. Putting them into the form of propositions they stand substantially thus:

1. The African race having sunk by gradual decline to the lowest state of degradation, misery, and crime, the order of the Divine Providence towards them requires that as they have sown the wind, they should reap the whirlwind—that in order to their regeneration and spirit-

ual elevation they should undergo a previous discipline of vastation which is being wisely accomplished by their lot of bitter bondage. This fact, however, is to be held in perfect consistency with the criminality of those who are the active agents in their oppression.

2. The circumstances of the first origination and of the subsequent perpetuation of slavery in our country are essentially different. When, after the passing away of the first generation of the enslaved, their descendants are born into the condition of servitude, and consequently have no opportunity to know any other, there can be no doubt that the intensity of the suffering under which they groan is somewhat abated, as the aggravation of contrast does not operate. So, on the other hand, the circumstance of a people being born into the condition of masters, as a hereditary distinction, constitutes a fair ground of charitable allowance on the score of whatever moral wrong may be involved in, or grow out of, the relation. It were scarcely to be expected that those who were born to this inheritance, when they see the relation existing everywhere around them, and seldom or never questioned, should be led to question it themselves apart from foreign prompting. But when this is done, and the light of truth is strongly concentrated upon the true character of the system, the extenuation arising from this source is done away. When, on the other hand, the conduct of the sons shows beyond dispute that they approve and appropriate the deeds of their fathers, they take upon themselves whatever of criminal responsibility attached to the first act of fraud, depredation, and oppression, which fixed the doom of bondage in a foreign clime on the natives of Negro land. But it is obvious that in numerous cases the entail would not be cordially accepted, when its genuine character came to be understood, and in such cases the relation of master and slave is as involuntary on the part of the master as it is on that of the slave. To both parties it is a compulsory relation, but as it has not been of their own seeking, the hand of the Divine Providence

is to be devoutly recognized in it, and co-operation with the end of that Providence to be diligently studied.

3. The abjectness to which the African race has reduced itself is such as to involve a degree of imbecility that makes it almost inevitable that they should fall under the controlling influence of some superior class. It is not difficult to conceive that this surveillance and predominance might, under proper limitations, be of essential service to them in the way of moral discipline. But then those upon whom it devolves are to bear in mind that the Divine Providence does not intend that this pupilage should be perpetual, and therefore they are never to lose sight of the elevation of the black man as an end.

4. There can be nothing required in the duty of emancipation which shall supersede the obligation of that peculiar guardianship which the incapacity of the Negro demands. In their present circumstances it is to the influence of slavery, in great measure, that that incapacity is due, and nothing could be more unjust than that those who have been its authors should take advantage of their own wrong, and make conscience itself a plea for the cruel dereliction of their helpless serfs. A debt of justice and of charity is due them. They claim, at the hands of those who have oppressed and impoverished them, such indemnity as they can render—the indemnity of that culture, mental and moral, which shall fit them for freedom here, and for felicity hereafter.

The tenor of the preceding discussion has, if we mistake not, paved the way for a more definite enunciation of what we conceive to be the law of charity in the matter before us. We have seen that there are certain general considerations suggested by the *providential* relations of slavery, which imperatively require to be taken into the account when the casuistry of the subject comes in question. We have seen that while there is an *immediate duty of emancipation* incumbent upon the holder of slaves, it is not at the same time the *duty of immediate emancipation*, for there is doubtless an important though nice distinction between the two, the na-

ture of which will be sufficiently obvious from what we have already said. The duty of *entering at once upon the incipency of an emancipating process* we have argued at length; and as this duty urges itself upon the individual in the first instance, we are warranted in pressing home the appeal to every one who can feel the force of Christian obligation, to obey the dictates of conscience wholly irrespective of the co-operation or kindred convictions of others. He is not in fact at liberty to merge himself in the community, and await legislative action before he himself acts. Each one is to do that which, if every other one did, the devoutly desired consummation would take place. By mentally abnegating the central falsity and evil of the system, without reference to any other will than the will of Heaven, he does in effect "wash his hands in innocency," as far as "the great transgression" of slavery is concerned. Other men have their duty to perform as he has his, and they are not to wait for each other.

But supposing this duty thus far performed—which we may call the duty of repentance—then the duty of good works, or of justice, mercy, and equity to the slave, becomes imperative. And here we would endeavor to make the slaveholder's case our own. We would put our soul in his soul's stead, and whatever we clearly see would be our duty in the supposed case, we are forced to consider as his duty in the actual case. And having settled it as our first duty to make a mental renunciation of the false principle lying at the foundation of the system, it seems, in the next place, an inevitable inquiry whether duty would fairly require the making known to our slaves the change that had taken place in our own minds, the proclaiming to them that we no longer regarded them as our property, and the assuring them at the same time that we should take immediate measures for setting them legally free. This might seem, at first blush, to be the only consistent course which a good man could pursue in the premises, and one so obvious that there could be no room for the least hesitation. But we

see clearly that we *should* hesitate, and that we should have good reasons for hesitating, for we could not feel at liberty to ignore the resulting consequences of the step. So far as we are able to judge, no end of true benevolent use or neighborly love, would be subserved by such an announcement. We cannot perceive that the master would thereby be enabled any better to compass the good of his slave than if he preserved the most rigid silence as to his interior views and purposes. Such an announcement might lead, on the part of the slaves, to restlessness and insubordination, and other mischiefs, while it would do nothing to advance their real interests. They would of course be informed on this head in due time, when better prepared for it. Meanwhile the interior conviction which we have supposed to have sprung up in the mind of the slaveholder is not to be without fruit. Fidelity to acknowledged principles will require that he should act as well as feel; and his actions should be in accordance with his feelings. He is bound to carry out into ultimatum those views of truth and duty which have become established in his mind, tending to elevate the slave, and to fit him for that form of freedom which infinite wisdom designs him to enjoy. He is bound in a firm, temperate, and dignified manner to exert his influence to bring his fellow-citizens to think and act with himself on the subject, and to agitate for the repeal of all those despotic laws which tend to frustrate the ends of the Divine mercy in regard to the enslaved. He is called upon to brave reproach, odium, ostracism—every consequence that may ensue upon the conscientious carrying out of his principles. Doing this, he in effect acquits himself of all evil participation in the system, and in the Divine estimate will be considered as having “broken the yoke and let the oppressed go free.”

It is clear, however, that the course now indicated is one that can never be followed except by those with whom profound religious principle is paramount. It involves too much self-denial and self-sacrifice to be acted upon by any others than those who are willing “to lose their

lives that they may save them." We cannot but be sensible that such a course requires nothing short of a *martyr spirit* in those who may be moved to enter upon it. And from this fact it must be evident to what a limited extent the views now advanced will be entertained. But we are not to "diminish aught" from the stern requisitions of the moral code to which this subject is amenable. And we are therefore bound to say, that there is no possibility, under the Divine government, of escaping the penalties of wrong-doing, even though we may ourselves have had no other than a hereditary relation to the wrong in question. All evil, and especially that of slaveholding, is a quick-set hedge which one can neither get into nor out of without laceration. A man must be willing to part with his property, and even to lay down his life, if needs be, for conscience' sake. Still it is a pleasant countervailing reflection that, in point of fact, this extremity of sacrifice is often precluded in the hidden workings of the Divine Providence. An unfeigned willingness meekly to resign everything from the force of moral principle, is often accepted by the Divine clemency for the fact, and the subject of it exempted from the actual privation which he was led to anticipate. In some mysterious way compensative dispensations occur, by which not only is outward impoverishment repaid by inward riches, but even temporal losses are made up by temporal gains. While, therefore no one can assure himself that he will not actually be called to suffer the loss of all things, and he is not at liberty to act on the presumption that he will be spared the infliction which he fears, yet he *may* be spared; and the more profound is his humiliation before Heaven, and the more submissively he kisses the rod, the more reason is there for the hope of exemption.

We have thus expounded our idea of the true nature of emancipation as dictated by the laws of charity and of order. It is a process which supposes the continuance, for the present, of the external relation between master and slave, while in its internal essence and spirit it has undergone an entire transformation, from the fact that

the central principle on which the system rests is sincerely renounced. That the conscientious master does not at once go the full length of manumission is because of the condition of mental incapacity which slavery has entailed upon its subjects, and of the impediments thrown in his way by the existing laws of the slave States, to disregard which would be to subject his bondmen to a worse lot than to retain them in his service while he was doing his utmost to effect the removal of these impediments. The slaveholding, if we so term it, which continues during this interval, we cannot regard as a sin *per se*. It is a mere temporary duress enforced by the stress of circumstances, and no more to be censured than would be the master's retention of his virtually liberated slaves, when he sees that the sending them forth would be exposing them unarmed and helpless to prowling wild beasts, poisonous serpents, or merciless banditti. It is a purely Providential barrier which interposes itself between the promptings of his own mind and the complete enfranchisement of his bondmen. Our position is, that the law of charity is satisfied with the procedure which we have indicated, provided there be no secret, subtle evasion of the demands of conscience on the score of protest and agitation aiming at a radical cure of all the evils of the institution.

Nothing, however, is clearer to us than that the course we have now suggested would by no means satisfy the ultra reformer. He will be content with nothing short of an *instant rupture* of all the bonds that connect master and slave, leaving out of view the whole train of consequences that may ensue upon the step. With this theory of abolition we do not sympathize, as it appears to us wholly to overlook those principles of action which are so emphatically recognized by the New Church. Acting under the influence of those principles, we feel assured that an eye is to be had to the contingencies of our conduct. The probable effect of our decision upon the welfare of the colored man is an element which is to be taken into the account in determining the duty owed him. We

are compelled, then, as far as we see, to forego the countenance and co-operation of this class of men. Urged on by the controlling power of one grand idea—that of *immediate emancipation* in every sense of the term—they have no sympathy to throw away upon those who are lingering far in the rear of their onward rapid course.

So again our line of argument will appear sadly defective to all those who would have the great problem of slavery solved on grounds that apply to all that are in any way concerned with it. But this is not our drift. We assume not to say what is the duty of those who do not at present acknowledge the truths which are paramount in the estimation of the man of the New Church. We are not writing for the promiscuous many, but for the select few. We have all along considered ourselves as addressing those who were accessible to the appeal of New Church principles, and who would therefore duly appreciate any friendly suggestions that might aid them in their ultimatum. We have taken it for granted that the truths which they receive come to them demanding with an authoritative voice to *be* ultimated, and that too without reference to the action of others. He that is wise is to be wise for himself, and popular precedent will weigh with him but little. It is with spirits of such a mould that we consider ourselves as having to do. “What have we to do to judge them that are without?” To their own master they stand or fall. We should never volunteer to grapple with the subject of slavery on political grounds, and as defended by political men. Viewed on that side it involves problems too vast and complicated for our feeble powers. We withdraw from it as from the vicinity of a volcanic mountain which has begun to heave and rumble in token of speedy eruption. To mere worldly and irreligious upholders of the system, what could we say? We are aiming to point out the legitimate operation of certain principles in reference to those who acknowledge the obligation of these principles. In respect to others, our first object would be of course to bring them to the knowledge and acknowledg-



ment of the principles in question, and when this was done they would come within the range of our remarks. But previous to this we have nothing to say of the light in which they are to regard their duty, though we have no hesitation to speak in strong terms of their sin.

It is, however, no difficult matter for us to perceive that even in regard to those whom we have especially in view in this discussion, it may be and perhaps will be suggested, that the policy proposed would be merely a perpetuating of slavery under the plea of discarding it. To this we can only say, that for ourselves we regard it as in a majority of cases the only practicable course to be pursued consistent with the claims of genuine justice. It strikes us as the only course which will satisfy the demands of conscience on the one hand and of charity on the other. Cases indeed there undoubtedly are where a man, acting in view of all the enactments of the civil code, can take his bondmen to a free State, or send them to Liberia or to Canada. When this can be done, let it be done. It will be a noble benefaction. But in thousands of instances this course cannot be counted upon. The ability is wanting even where the disposition is present. A providential hindrance hedges up the way. What alternative then remains but that the external relation be continued for the present, while its internal character is totally changed in consequence of the mental change above described? To the Newchurchman the whole subject will come up in the light of a providential ordainment bearing upon his regeneration. He will safely draw the conclusion that, all things considered, his regeneration will be best promoted in the circumstances in which he is placed, and that for the same reason that of the black man also—which the Lord equally regards—is under the best auspices in the heritage of *service*, not of *slavery*, where his lot has fallen. On both sides the aim should be the compassing of the ultimate ends of the divine benignity in reference to both. To a right state of mind the relation of master to slave will be, as we have already intimated, no more voluntary

than that of slave to master. It will be a compelled relation to both parties, and yet both recognizing a special providence in it, it may be transformed to a blessing to both ; but in order to this its genius must be transformed by the mental process which we have all along made so prominent.\*

No one can be more fully aware than ourselves of the thousandfold adverse influences that must in the slave States oppose the realizing of the results which all good men would fain have brought about in respect to this matter. The institution itself has generated a world of corrupt sentiment and practice which prevents its true character being discovered or the true remedy applied. It has for its supporters thousands of men who are totally reckless of its moral bearings, and who ply it as a grand engine for working out their worldly weal, with about the same unconcern as the California miner does *his* crushing machine for extracting gold from quartz. Men of this stamp, so far as they feel the need of any justification at all of the system which they uphold, and *as* they uphold it, are prone to avail themselves of pleas drawn from fallacious sources, the speciousness of which not unfrequently avails to impose upon Newchurchmen themselves. One of these is drawn from the alleged antagonism between the genius of the black and white races. The argument embodies itself in the proposition, *that two distinct classes of people, nearly equal in numbers, and yet unlike in color, manner, habits, feelings, and states of civilization, to such a degree that amalgamation (by intermarriage) is impossible, cannot dwell together in the same community, unless the one be in subjection to the other.* The past history of the world does undoubtedly afford some countenance to this idea, and if we assume that the same principles of selfishness and the same worldly passions are ever to bear rule among men, the position would continue to hold good. But the man

---

\* The hints of our esteemed correspondent on "The External Laws of Order," in the August No. of the Repository, will be found extremely pertinent in this connection.

of the New Church is taught to recognize a transforming power in the truths of the dispensation now being ushered in, which will eventually so change the internal states of men, as to nullify the force of precedents and make the past no longer a model of the future. We do not indeed anticipate any such millennium as shall obliterate national distinctions and fuse the genius of different races into one common type, but we look for such a moulding influence from the operative laws of charity, such a harmonizing of social interests, that native repugnances, though not extinguished, shall yet be so regulated and subordinated as to conduce to the greater perfection of the grand social man. Every portion of that extended spiritual corporeity will then perform its distinct function in perfect accordance with every other portion, and as there will then be servile uses necessary, so there will be those who have a native love of those uses, and will perform them as cheerfully as the occupants of a higher plane perform theirs. If we rightly read the African genius there is in it a servile element, a something which prompts them to occupy a menial sphere, and renders them more happy and contented in that sphere than in any other. We do not of course recognize in this fact a warrant for their reduction to a state of slavery, but we do perceive in it a ground for the *voluntary* adoption hereafter of *service* as the permanent sphere of their use. All that is needed is for them to have an intelligent view of the truths of heaven and of the principles of the Divine Order, and to yield a hearty concurrence therewith; for the law of that order is that every one should follow his promptings and adaptations in the discharge of his peculiar functions. Every function that is demanded by the exigencies of the social body is in itself honorable, and the language of the apostle is in this relation pre-eminently pertinent.

“For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many are one body; so also is Christ. For the body is not one member but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of

the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? if the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it has pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now they are many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more, those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary. And those members of the body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor, and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. For our comely parts have no need; but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked: that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."

The perfection of society is when all this is understood and acted upon freely by all its members. When thus acted upon on a large scale in our country, we see not why there is not scope for the colored race to bring into play their characteristic proclivities, forming an integral but relatively subordinate part of the social man, at once without compulsion and without reproach. There is certainly truth in what is said by one of the interlocutors in "Uncle Tom," that "if there is rough work to be done, there must be rough hands to do it," and if there are such hands, and they love to do such work, why should they not do it? Why should not this be the self-selected sphere of their operation, in which all their innate tendencies shall be developed without conflict with any other member of the social commune to which they belong? And may we not reasonably suppose that in this way the moral affinity shall overpower the national antipathy of which we are treating?

Upon one other specious plea, originating from this source, we will dwell for a moment. It is not unfrequently maintained that the slavery obtaining in the American Union is countenanced by the Scriptures, and precedents

are sought with avidity in the example of Abraham and other patriarchs. To the argument, as urged on this ground by the advocates of the system, we shall not attempt to reply. Mr. Barnes and others, by the most luminous expositions, have shown its fallacy, in our estimation, beyond all dispute. But when a New Churchman has recourse to Holy Writ for a justification of the system, we are vastly puzzled to know how to take him. Admitting as he does, the spiritual sense of the Word, and consequently of these ancient histories, why does he here set aside that sense, and build his authority upon that of the letter? Is there not something like double dealing here? Is there not a voice like Jacob's while the hands have the feel of Esau's? Can we consistently play back and forth between the sense of the letter and the sense of the spirit to serve a turn in this matter? If we can do it here, can we not by parity of reasoning do it also in the case of polygamy and of the Canaanitish wars? Are we prepared then to appear to be so recreant to our avowed principles as to entrench ourselves behind the breast-work of the letter, when on every other subject we should plant ourselves upon the purport of the spirit? We have not, it will be observed, appealed at all to the authority of the Scriptures in the foregoing discussion; and the reason why we have not done so is, that the *principles* on which the great question is to be decided are principles inlaid in the constitution and the intuitions of the human mind, and may thus be termed a prior authority to that of the written Word, though still accordant with its true interior teaching. It would have been idle for *us* to have cited any thing but the moral and preceptive passages which apply to the case, and these are all summed up in the grand golden precept of doing to others as we would that they should do to us. So far as our suggestions have been in accordance with this rule, we have in fact built our plea upon the authority of the Word all along throughout the whole course of the discussion, and from this source we deem ourselves abundantly confirmed in our main position as to the duty

of the conscientious slaveholder, to wit, that he should mentally but sincerely renounce the evil and the falses of the institution, while at the same time he shall not consider himself exonerated from the present charge of his freedmen, but shall perform towards them the duties involved in the outward relation.

If it be objected that the law knows no such casuistical abstractions, but regards all as slaves who are not formally freed, and that consequently the death of such an emancipator would leave his servants exposed to the terrors of the auction mart, we can only reply, but if he sincerely does that which he thinks to be right and best under the circumstances, he is not required to burden his mind with a dread of consequences. He has discharged his responsibility according to the fullest light he possessed, and he may safely leave the issues with Him who is competent to govern them. So also in view of the possibility that his children or heirs may not share in his convictions or carry out his wishes after his decease. He is bound during his lifetime to do all in his power to impress upon them his own sense of the law of neighborly love, and to acquaint them with his desires, and then calmly leave the event to Providence.

Having now accomplished all that we aimed at, in the outset, in our own discussion, and waving any further comment, we resign our space to the remaining Aphorisms of our correspondent, (A. E. F.)

#### IX.

It results that the thing properly imputable to the South in regard to slavery is, that it has not yet originated any associated and political action aiming at the speedy removal of its more crying abuses, and the ultimate abolition of all ownership of man by man.

#### X.

The movement called abolition has a good and holy element in it; it being presumably a result, together with many other efforts towards reform, of the last judgment. Slavery like every other evil has a principle of aggression with it, whereby it tends, of its own nature, to extend itself territorially, and to be aggravated within its old bounds; the

providential end of abolition is to hold this tendency in check, and to remove slavery itself eventually.

# XI.

This good element, which may be named "humanity," is alloyed by an evil one which may be called "impatience," which produces various falses, but principally the dogma that the immediate emancipation of all slaves is required by the precepts of the Christian religion.

# XII.

That the dogma is false, may appear by the following considerations.

(a.) Society in any State where slavery exists is in a certain order.

(b.) This order is induced upon it by the action of the Divine Providence itself, according to the moral elements which are found in it, or, in other words according to the character of its various classes.

(c.) This order, though not good in itself if the elements are evil in whole or in part, is the best possible, the subject considered. Thus the order which obtains in any of the hells, though the opposite of heavenly order, yet is induced by the Lord, and is the result of his presence.

(d.) Where one class, therefore, is ignorant, vicious, improvident, and submissive, and another is intelligent, proud, imperious, and fond of wealth, the relations of master and slave are permitted by the Divine Providence to exist for the welfare of both.

(e.) To change this order for one in itself better (i. e. to abolish the relation of master and slave), without a change in the moral elements from which it results (i. e. without producing in the ruling class a sense of justice, equity, and fraternity, and in the subject class, intelligence, providence, and probity), is to destroy Divine Order. To advocate the change *any farther or faster than as this preparation is made beforehand* is, in that degree, to maintain falses which molest Divine Order.

(f.) The preparation must necessarily be slow and gradual. This is plain, whether we regard the internal change of sentiment which is to be brought about, or the means, such as the truer preaching of the Gospel, the wider diffusion of knowledge, provision of the means of education, &c., by which it is to be effected. These six considerations show, it is hoped, that the dogma of immediate abolition is false.

# XIII.

If it is false that immediate abolition is the duty of the South, then the South is justified, to the extent in which this false reigns in the abolition movement, in opposing it with zeal, because, to that extent, it acts in unison with Divine Order, and for self-preservation.

## XIV.

The abolition movement weakens itself by taking ground which has right and reason in some degree against it, and would strengthen itself by tempering its impatience, and giving up its demand of immediate abolition as a duty required by the precepts of religion.

## XV.

This it will gradually be brought to do, because all public movements good in their principle, advance by certain stages, becoming less crude and more rational by time and experience. It will hereby pervade the community more generally, and though less violent, have more real power against the evil it opposes.

## XVI.

It may be apparent, if the above principles are true, what is every man's duty towards abolition. It may be stated under the following heads :

(1) Never to deny the divine element in it under pretence of the falses connected with the movement ; on the contrary, to acknowledge what is good and true in it, and to favor and act with it to that extent.

(2) To bring it, as far as possible, more in accordance with the laws of Divine Order by opposing what is violent about it, and remonstrating with what is false.

## APPENDIX.

As we had anticipated in the outset, the foregoing discussion produced a very unmistakable sensation among our Southern subscribers. Letters from that quarter soon began to pour in, remonstrating with the writer for broaching so unpalatable a subject, and in some cases ordering the immediate discontinuance of the Repository. These latter cases, however, were comparatively few, and we are happy also to state, that some of the warmest testimonies of approbation elicited by the articles came from the South. Of these we published numerous extracts in our pages at the time, as we did also those of another tone, of which we have concluded to insert in this connexion one of the best specimens, together with our reply. It comes from the pen of a distinguished and much respected N. C. brother, in one of the Southern states. As the discussion proceeded, the extreme sensitiveness which it encountered in the beginning appeared gradually to die



away, and in the end nearly every name which had been withdrawn was again restored to our subscription list. In view, however, of the spirit evinced in several of these communications, we ventured at the time to express ourselves in the following language :—" We cannot but suggest to our Southern friends, that the fact that the sphere of slavery generates such a spirit of intolerance, betrays beyond question the intrinsic evil that inheres in it. Can any further evidence be needed that there must be a baleful element in the institution, when the very mild and moderate tone of our articles has not failed to give so much offence and provoke so much censure among those from whom a gentle response were reasonably expected? Divesting ourselves to the utmost of all undue selfish regards, and sitting calmly in judgment on our own essays on the subject, we are utterly unable to see that we have advanced anything to which a candid mind can take exceptions. In the exercise of a cool and dispassionate spirit, without vituperation or ill blood, we have endeavored to pronounce an honest and impartial judgment on the moral aspects of slavery. What is there in this that can justly subject the writer to a sinister construction? If he is " thrice strongly armed who hath his quarrel just," surely his paucity must be weak indeed who quarrels only with the arguments urged against slavery. And in the present case this intolerance is still more inexcusable from the fact, that the teachings of the New Church do tend in a most remarkable manner to correct the extravagances of the reform spirit and to bring out to view those aspects of the subject which tell most powerfully on the side of the slaveholder. Confident at least we are that but for the light thrown on the subject by the revelations of the New Church, we should never have felt the force, or even, as we may say, have got upon the track, of those extenuating pleas which we have freely cited in behalf of those who find themselves compelled by the circumstances of their lot to participate in the responsibilities of a relation from which they would gladly recede if they knew how consistently to do it. It is sincerely to be hoped that due weight may be given to these considerations, and that no restraint be imposed upon the freest discussion of the subject within the church, for we can assure our Southern friends that nothing will tend so effectually to convert Northern abolitionists to whatever is *true and tenable* in their positions as the study and the agitation of the subject on genuine New Church grounds." We should use the same language now.

M ———, April 12, 1852. <sup>71</sup>

MY DEAR SIR :—I take the liberty of expressing to you the pain which I feel, arising from the broaching of the Slavery question in the

Repository. If I may do so without offence, (as none is certainly intended,) I would enter my solemn but respectful remonstrance against the continuance of the discussion. "Cui bono?" At the North and West and East, your argument, however able (and I am quite sure it will be able,) can do no good, because not needed; all, without perhaps a solitary exception, are already in accord with you upon the abstract question. At the South your audience is not in a state of mind to appreciate or even hear, with patience, the discussion. In this remark I do not intend to concede or deny any position assumed in your opening commentaries upon the "Aphorisms," for the reason that I do not desire to join issue with you. The subject has been diseussed in every form and aspect, and, if possible, the parties to the debate are as wide apart as when they began. You will excuse me, if I express my doubt whether, with *your* great ability and learning, you will produce anything new. The country has just passed through a crisis of intense excitement on the slavery question, and the Southern States are yet writhing under the chargin and humiliation of having been robbed in the name of philanthropy, and under the forms of legislation, of a just participation in our territorial possessions. It is true, by large majorities, they have accepted the compromise measures; but it has been under sullen, significant, and fearful protests. The fury of the tempest has passed from the bosom of the deep, but its waters are yet agitated to its lowest caverns. Now, in all candor, I appeal to your enlightened judgment to decide whether this be a propitious time to broach a subject so delicate? It must be obvious that you are not speaking to the North—it is not her people that you mainly desire to enlighten; for, as before observed, they are with you already. It is the Southern slaveholder that you would reach; it is to his judgment, reason, and conscience that you would present your appeal. But you come to him when he is stung by the remembrance of recent wrongs, when he is exasperated by what he regards an attempt by those, whose business it is not, to intermeddle with his domestic rights, peace, and security. Before such an auditory, can you expect to be heard? Sir, the argument of an *angel* would be as impotent as the wailings of an infant against the fury of a tornado.

But let me not do injustice to your position. The spirit of your remarks is good—your motive above suspicion, and you propose, as a New Churchman to speak to New Churchmen. You are most guarded in avoiding the *political* aspect; you seem *designedly* to withhold all sympathy (I believe you have none) with the fanaticism of abolitionism; and you wish to argue the question calmly and dispassionately upon New Church grounds. I appreciate the position you take, and individually I can say, that thus far I detect nothing in your remarks in the least offensive. But still, pardon my candor if I express the belief that the discussion will do infinite mischief to the cause of the New Church in the South. In this section the number of receivers is small, they are scattered and isolated; if they avow their doctrines they are sneered at and denounced as having embraced

one among the most absurd *isms* of the day. Now in addition to all this, can it be possible that it is the design of a Good Providence, that they shall be classed with abolitionism? You may repudiate abolition as earnestly as you please, you may disavow it in behalf of the New Church, you may enter your solemn protest against all political interference with the subject, and yet I must tell you, that the discussion which you have begun will as certainly identify the New Church with the odium of that despicable *ism*, in the Southern estimation—just as certainly as you prosecute it. Now, do you wish to place your Southern brethren in such a position? Is it not a wrong to the New Church to do so? These are pointed questions, but they cover no insinuations or reflections. They are prompted by feelings of great kindness and respect for you, and deep solicitude for the spread of the Heavenly Doctrines.

Perhaps I may add strength to the above remarks, if I tell you, that, so far as relates to the New Church in the South, your position is both commanding and peculiar. I mean no flattery; but you are highly respected in that section of the country for distinguished talent and learning, as well as honesty of purpose and conscientious research. You are regarded as a true exponent of New Church sentiment, doctrine and policy. Your Southern brethren look to you as an able champion, and lean on you in times of conflict and difficulty. *All this is true.* Now, connect it with the exceeding sensitiveness of the Southern mind,—the isolated condition of your brethren, the weakness of the New Church, the thousand other prejudices against which she has to contend, and then decide whether it is just to yourself and just to Southern receivers, gravely, at this crisis to promulgate anti-slavery as the genius, spirit, tendency of the New Church, aye, and *duty* of New Churchmen. Allow me to say, that I think you assume a fearful responsibility, in thus occasioning new perils and new trials to the hopes and toils of your scattered brethren in the South.

Of course you will reply to all this, that the South will have no right to place such a construction, that it will be unfair to identify the New Church with abolition upon such a ground. This may be true. But it will not avert the mischief. This raises the question of expediency. Then, I would ask, is it inconsistent with the spirit and doctrines of the New Church, sometimes to consult expediency? Your views on the question of slavery may be sound; it may be that you can sustain them by argument, but does *duty* imperatively demand that you should promulgate them now? Is it not lawful, even under New Church light, to withhold them for her sake? Has she not difficulties enough already on hand? Can they all be dispatched at once? If not, and they are to be encountered one by one, why may not this be deferred till she gets more strength, and her policy and spirit shall be better understood?

You see that the view I take is purely practical. We must take the world as it is. God himself consulted this great principle in giving his revelation. He suited it to man as he was, *natural*, as he is.

*somewhat spiritual*, and as he shall be, *celestial*. Now, without questioning the correctness of your opinion, as to the genius of the New Church, in reference to slavery, (for my aim is to arrest rather than provoke a needless discussion,) I would ask if it is not equally wise and lawful for her to approach man as he is—buried in sensualism—and deal with the existing state of things in the best, most prudent and expedient way, in order to elevate the race to the spiritual plane?

Now without expressing any opinion on the abstract question, my view of slavery is simply this. The relation of master and slave has been permitted of Providence in all ages. I can see that Southern slavery is most wise and benevolent, indicating the only probable means by which the African race can ever be civilized and christianized. The work is actually in progress, but is greatly retarded by the exceeding kindness of our Northern friends, who feel very anxious to render some assistance to the Lord in effecting his providential purposes. It may be that the Southern slaveholder is derelict in duty—does not do enough. It is quite certain that the Northern so-called philanthropist attempts too much. Then, the position of good sense is just this: the Lord will do all things right; He will work out the ends designed by slavery. It concerns us, not the North. If we fail in duty, *we* are responsible. We do know a little about relative duties, our social interests, our domestic security; and we *have* some idea of accountability for our dealings towards our slaves. But all this is ignored by the North, and we are classed with pirates and robbers. If they would only let us alone, how much good sense they would exhibit!

But you think the New Church has a mission to perform on this subject. Yes, and so think Northern Presbyterians and Methodists and Baptists in reference to their several sects. And they all base their opinions upon the *abstract question*. They all begin very moderately, very gently; offering advice and argument and brotherly sympathy. But you know that they have long since degenerated into the veriest fanaticism, in both discussion and operation. Now, if the New Church enters the field, where is the guaranty that she will not run into similar folly and extravagance? It does seem to me, that the New Church, above all others, should confide the whole subject to Providence, and trust to the enlightening and elevating tendency of her doctrines.

Southern slavery is destined to run a long career yet. It is a means to a great end—the ultimate elevation of the African race. Man cannot, if he would, abolish it suddenly. It is upon us; it is ours to do our duty to the slave, care for his wants, provide for his comforts, secure him the benefits of religion, open to his mind the lofty themes of immortality. This the New Church inculcates by her spirit and doctrines, in my judgment, more forcibly than the Old. At present, our negroes cannot be educated. Our safety forbids it. But why? Because abolition will tamper with them, and poison their minds, and make them dissatisfied. This blessing is denied them for

this reason, and this only. It was not prohibited by law, in most of the slave States, until the abolition agitation began. Now, I am not disposed to abate a jot from our obligations. They are obvious ; they press upon us ; we are bound to do our duty to them *as slaves*. If we do it, we are free from sin ; if we do it, then the Lord will take care of results, and as soon as they are fitted for liberty, he will provide the means. Freedom *now* would be to them the greatest calamity. They could not exist *among* us. They would be exterminated by a war between the races. The benevolent and philanthropic North will not receive them. They cannot be transported ; it would exhaust the entire resources of the country. How then ? We are brought back again to the ground of common sense. *Let the slaveholder perform with fidelity, his duty to them as slaves, and then confide their future destination to the developments of a wise and good Providence ; and let these duties be performed with a spirit of entire and perfect subordination to the indications of Providence.*

Now, my dear sir, if you are content to rest the subject upon that ground, I think you will see that your "aphorisms" and comments are unnecessary, calculated to do no good, but much mischief. And if to this you will connect the confidence, that we of the South are daily considering the subject in all its aspects, that there is intelligence enough among us to know our duty, and honesty enough to do it, if we can be allowed to do it in our own way, without the dictation of those whom it does not concern ; and the additional confidence of the elevating and enlightening tendency of the New Dispensation, you need have no misgivings. Slavery will work out its destiny under the guidance of a kind and beneficent Providence. What that destination may be is among the arcana of the future. But if I were to indulge a conjecture, I would suggest the possibility, that our slaves following the tide of time and events, may yet find a home in South America, where climate and soil suit them ; where color does not affect caste in the social organization, and where they may have a system of government and laws adapted to their grade of civilization, whatever it may then be.

Very respectfully and sincerely,

Your obedient servant,

H. V. J.

#### REPLY.

The above communication, penned in so admirable a spirit, and teeming with sentiments of the kindest personal regard, while at the same time earnest and firm in deprecating results which the writer thinks sure to follow, have come home to us with the force of a most powerful appeal. We should be utterly at a loss to know how to be ever on good terms with ourselves again, were

we to be insensible to the plea which is here urged against the agitation of the subject of Slavery in our pages. The fact is we feel it to our heart's core. Not only from the writer of the foregoing letter, but from our N. C. brethren at the South generally, have we received so many and such signal tokens of warm fraternal sympathy and regard, that the idea of saying or doing anything that shall give them pain falls upon us like a bar of ice. May we not ask of them the justice to believe, that nothing short of the most imperious sense of duty could have prompted the expression of views that we could not but know would be more or less unacceptable in the quarter for which they were mainly intended? Indeed, if we were to refer to the feelings of the martyr going to the stake, as a not unfair index of our own in entering upon this discussion, we should scarcely exceed the soberness of truth. We have never in our lives been more conscious of a severe struggle between duty urging on and inclination holding back, than on this occasion. It is only by reason of a dear-bought victory over the clamorous remonstrances of a host of opposing considerations that we have at last brought ourselves to the point of utterance. We foresaw from the first the probable, the almost inevitable, issue. We were aware of the "revolt of mien," of the revulsion of feeling, of the altered voice, of the weakened sympathy, of the forfeited confidence, of the tasked charity, which could not fail to ensue. Heaven knows what an effort it has cost us to come to a decision which would necessarily put all these things at stake. But the effort has been made; the decision has been achieved.

If now we say that the end was too clearly anticipated from the beginning, to allow of retrogression after having taken the first step forward, we should be happy could we persuade our Southern friends to believe that our persistence in the deprecated course is not the effect of mere waywardness, or of an undervaluing of the force of their arguments, but of an immoveable conviction that a spiritual use is to be performed, from which we do not

feel at liberty to shrink. The assurance is wrought in the very depths of our soul that the best weal of the New Church demands the discussion of the subject, and that too at an early period in her history, as such a course now may preclude disastrous agitation at a future day. We do not indeed assume that precisely the views which we may broach are those that will be eventually rested in; but the expression of our sentiments may pave the way for the final establishment of the truth on this head; and if there be a special responsibility in broaching the theme, that responsibility we venture to assume. That in the accomplishment of our purpose, some of the apparently evil effects above predicted may incidentally follow we think not unlikely; but even the positive assurance of this does not strike us as a sufficient reason for desisting, since nothing is plainer to our perception than that *truth spoken in love can never really injure any cause or interest which it is designed to promote*. The mischief is done by an angry and malignant spirit, prompting unqualified condemnation, and urging reform, reckless of the laws of divine order. Of such a spirit we venture to acquit ourselves; and so far as we are free from this, so far we not only claim indulgence in the utterance of our sentiments, but have also the utmost confidence that no really bad results will follow. We assume that we are addressing a select and limited public. We are not throwing promiscuously abroad incendiary and irritating views; but offering calm suggestions to sober minds, to professed receivers of the teachings of the New Church, in which we find an ample warrant for the step we have taken.

Among the principles of this system of doctrine nothing is more clearly enunciated than that evils must be shunned as sins before any good, that is really good, can be done. The following propositions constitute several of the heads of Swedenborg's little treatise entitled, "The N. J. Doctrine of Life."—"That all religion has relation to life, and the life of religion is to do good—that no one can do good, which is really good, from himself—that so far as man shuns evils as sins, so far he does what is

good, not from himself, but from the Lord—that the good things which a man wills and does, before he shuns evils as sins, are not good—that the pious things which a man thinks and speaks, before he shuns evils, are not pious—that so far as any one shuns evils as sins, so far he loves truths—that the decalogue teaches what evils are sins—that it is not possible for any one to shun evils as sins, so that he may hold them inwardly in aversion, except by combats against them,” &c.

Again, on this subject he remarks, “Who cannot see that the Lord cannot flow-in from heaven with man, and teach him and lead him before his evils are removed, for they withstand, repel, pervert, and suffocate the truths and goods of heaven, which urgently press, powerfully apply, and endeavor to flow-in from above: for evils are infernal and goods are celestial, and all that is infernal burns with hatred against all that is celestial. Hence now it is evident, that before the Lord can flow-in from heaven with heaven, and form man to the image of heaven, the evils must necessarily be removed which reside heaped up together in the natural man. Now, whereas it is the primary thing that evils be removed before man can be taught and led by the Lord, the reason is manifest why, in eight precepts of the decalogue, the evil works are recounted which are not to be done, but not the good works which are to be done: good does not exist together with evil, nor does it exist before evils are removed, the way not being opened from heaven into man until this is done; for man is as a black sea, the waters whereof are to be removed on either side before the Lord in a cloud and in fire can cause the sons of Israel to pass through.”—*A. E.* 969.

These are positions which will not be doubted by New-churchmen; and the only question is, whether there be an evil in slavery which comes into the category of evils that are to be shunned as sins. And on this head we do not see how we can be mistaken in regarding it in this light, for the confession, though not universal, is yet very general even among slaveholders themselves, that the institu-



tion is an evil which it were better to have abolished, provided the attempt to do this did not occasion, all things considered, a still greater evil. We venture, then, to take this admission as an admission made in earnest, and under the promptings of charity presume to give vent to such sentiments as the subject in its various relations suggests. They are uttered under the strong impression that the true development of the New Church life may be retarded by the non-removal of an evil prevailing among those who cordially receive the truths of the Church, and who, but for this evil, would abound in the noblest exemplifications of the transforming power of these truths. Even granting that we may be in fact mistaken in this impression, yet we can see no offence in this matter worthy of censure; nor is it altogether characteristic of a consciously upright and unassailable moral state to be thus sensitive and restive in view of a candid investigation. The confidence which belongs to a good cause will be little likely to be disturbed by the interrogation to which that cause may be submitted by the charitable and well disposed.

Still we are well aware of the force with which the question is put:—Why broach the topic *now*, when exacerbad feeling closes the mind against all counsel or monition, however well intended, and when too the New Church at the South, in the feebleness of its incipency, is but poorly able to bear the brunt of obloquy which the assertion of such principles, in its name, is calculated to draw upon it? Shall we frankly say, in reply to this, that we embrace the present opportunity because, in all probability, it will be the *only* one of which we can avail ourselves for the purpose. As this may strike our readers as an enigmatical intimation, we explain ourselves by announcing that we see no prospect, from present appearances, that we shall be able to carry on the Repository after the present year. The complaints of the controversial character of the work are so numerous, and the calls for a change of tone in this respect so urgent, that we are satisfied that, without a complete metamor-

phosis in this particular, we can never satisfy the N. C. public to such an extent as to make it any object, peculiarly, to continue the publication, especially if the proceeds of the journal are to constitute our main dependence for support. We have become entirely satisfied that it is out of our power to conduct a periodical devoted to the cause of the N. C., without a very considerable infusion of the controversial element. In a word, we think that, under any circumstances, the same general features which have hitherto marked the N. C. Repository would still adhere to it, for they seem to be dictated by the natural progress of the Church in connection with the spirit of the age. It is clear, however, that this character of the journal is not acceptable to the mass of receivers in our country—those upon whom its support must necessarily depend—and therefore we see no alternative but to retire from the field in which we have hitherto endeavored to accomplish some use. Add to this that the present discussion itself—as we have foreseen from the beginning—will inevitably have the effect, whether deservedly or not, to thin the ranks of our subscribers, as it is palpable that our Southern friends, with their views of expediency on this subject, cannot, as a body, lend their countenance or patronage to a periodical which takes the ground that we are constrained to do; and the subduction of the Southern names from our list would leave the remainder, even if controversy did not alienate them, too “feeble a folk” to sustain the enterprise.

It is under these circumstances that we have concluded to open the discussion in behalf of which we are now offering our plea. We are confident that through no other accessible organ could we utter the sentiments which we hold on this theme, and which yet we are inwardly constrained to utter. We have decided, therefore, while the opportunity is afforded, to improve it. If what we say is entitled to bear weight with it, it will do so. If not, not; and in either case we shall be content under the consciousness of having meant well, and the conviction of having declared some truths.

From this our readers will easily infer that we are not prepared to take quite so sombre a view of consequences as seems to force itself upon the minds of the writers above. We do not think it "vain to speak of *motives*" as being powerless "to regulate or control *results*;" nor do we admit that the present is by any means a state of things in which "the argument of an *angel* would be as impotent as the wailings of an infant against the fury of a tornado." We are forced to put this to the account of a certain tendency to exaggeration, incident to impulsive and fervid natures, especially when kindled by a strong sense of wrong. We, however, do not propose to address an audience composed of such materials. We make our appeal to Newchurchmen, and we do not recognize in Newchurchmen a liability to fall into a state in which rational argument, prompted by pure motives, shall so utterly fail of courteous entertainment. We can, indeed, make all suitable allowance for the irritation and excitement engendered by stirring political crises, but the injunction, "In patience possess ye your souls," we may presume will not lose its authority with those whose inner ear we would fain gain to our remarks. We cannot, in fact, well conceive a *proper* state of mind in which the still small voice of truth and charity shall not, with a true man of the New Church, make itself heard above the din and turbulence of party strife, or the clamors of otherwise excited passion. If our suggestions shall be taken home by each reader to himself, and their possible or probable effects upon others be lost sight of, we might hope, with much confidence, that the deprecated result would not be at all so disastrous as the vivid pencil of our friends is inclined to paint it. The objections urged on this score would be more apropos if we had entered upon a course or a crusade of indiscriminate propagandism, which is as far as possible from our intention. We have an audience of our own, and our drift is to say to each one, How do *you* regard the sentiments which we advance? We do not ask what effect you think they will have on others. Our conference is solely with you.

There is another misapprehension in the above letter which we would here correct. The writer remarks, "At the North and West and East your argument, however able, can do no good, because not needed—all, without perhaps a solitary exception, are already in accord with you upon the abstract question." Alas, would that they were! The intimation, we are sorry to say, is far enough from the truth, judging at least from the results of our own observation. The verbal concession, indeed, that slavery is intrinsically an evil, is very easily, as it is very generally, made—as it is also in thousands of instances at the South; but we find, on a little closer interrogation, that the concession is of no practical moment, inasmuch as it is also very widely held in the same quarters that there is no prospect of getting rid of it for some generations to come; and that our duty as Christians is to submit to it as a mysterious but wise and beneficent dispensation of the Divine Providence, designed for the ultimate good of all parties concerned, but more especially of the African race. So far as our acquaintance extends, this is the prevailing sentiment of Newchurchmen in every part of our land. We know not that we have ever conversed with half a dozen individuals of that Church who did not occupy this ground—who apparently felt the least painful-solicitude in view of the existence of the institution—and who would not cordially side with the protesting purport of the above letter, and wonder at the temerity of the discussion which this letter so kindly but so pointedly rebukes. This appears to be the general posture of the New Church mind in this country; and as we regard it as a species of practical fatalism, we cannot of course but aim to break it up, wherever our feeble voice may penetrate. On this point, we are conscious, to our regret, of standing very much alone—not indeed in the belief that the evil in question is under the auspices of the Divine Providence, and will be overruled to the final weal of the colored race, but in regard to *the course of action* which the true principles of charity dictate under the circumstances. The following passage in

another letter we have received on the subject defines, if we mistake not, the general position of the New Church on this subject: "I do not think that *our mission* required this. It has nothing to do with the institutions, civil or political, of this world. It is to preach love to God and love to our neighbor, and to avoid all cause of offence. Hitherto—and we of the South felt proud that it was so—the Church has refrained from touching this delicate and much vexed question. It has left it to the direction of a wise and merciful Providence, trusting that, if evil, it would in the course of time yield to good." This paragraph brings to view the question of a principle of transcendent importance in its bearings upon New Church life. We are constrained to take ground directly the opposite of that of the writer. We believe the New Church can never be fully faithful to its mission without entering into direct collision with every form of evil that exists among men. We have no faith in mere abstract and general deprecations or denunciations of what is contrary to absolute truth and good. There must be a hand-to-hand encounter, a direct looking in the face, an emphatic specification, a stern arraignment at the bar of eternal right, of every form of wrong, whether in civil, political, or social spheres. This indeed is to be done in the spirit of genuine charity, but it is to be done. Pulpit and press we hold to be recreant to their function, if they content themselves with merely vague moral injunctions, and refuse to follow men into the minutest ramifications of their wordly callings and relations, whether public or private, and insisting upon the rigid ultimatum in life of every principle of religion which they hold, or ought to hold, in theory. Politicians may talk of the wisdom of "a masterly inactivity," but it is sadly out of place in the men of the Lord's church. It is, in our view, a very great fallacy to expect that needed reforms will take care of and accomplish themselves, and that the simple preaching of love to the Lord, and love to the neighbor, will renovate society, without the positive putting the finger upon the diseased parts of the

body politic, and actually grappling with the crooked things that are to be made straight, and the rough places that are to be made smooth.

These are the views which we are compelled to entertain, on the general subject of which the present is a particular department. And so believing, we come directly up abreast of the theme, and in all honesty and earnestness impart our convictions to our brethren. We may fail to secure a tolerant audience, but if so, we shall be careful so to order our speech as not to give any *just* occasion to censure, crimination, or rejection on the part of those addressed. If, then, without occasion, they take exceptions to our plea, we shall still feel mentally at ease, and under no necessity, like the restless Roman, to borrow a neighbor's pillow, because we cannot extract repose from our own.

One of our correspondents intimates that we shall probably be unable to advance anything new on the subject. Of this, we can give, indeed, no assurance; it is truth rather than novelty that we aim at; but we cherish still a strong persuasion that at least our mode of conducting the argument will be new. The sequel will disclose that without in the least compromising the great essential principle for which we contend, we at the same time make discriminations, qualifications, reservations, which have been hitherto unknown in the controversy, and which will strike our Southern readers with the more force, inasmuch as they have never supposed it possible that the demands of a stringent abolitionism could possibly consist with moderation of tone, or such concessions to the force of circumstances as they will find in our treatment of the theme. We can easily conceive, however, that with multitudes these traits shall not redeem the discussion from obloquy; but we can hardly anticipate this reception with those whom we purpose to reach. Should it be so, we shall regret it much for their sakes, but none for our own.

A word as to the charge of unwarranted interference. "The position of good sense is just this: The Lord will

do all things right ; He will work out the ends designed by slavery. It concerns us—not the North. If we fail in duty we are responsible.” “Southern members of the New Church have reflected on this subject for themselves—they have formed their own opinions—they entertain these opinions conscientiously—they are able to defend them by sound arguments. The question is a Southern and not a Northern question. You have no slaves at the North. The responsibility rests with the slaveholders of the South, and any attempt to agitate this matter by our Northern brethren, seems to us an unjustifiable interference with our own concerns.” It would be somewhat hazardous, we think, to this position, to submit it to a very rigid examination. There can be no “unjustifiable interference” in this matter, unless it involves, in some way, an infraction of the laws of charity. The simple assumption of pointing out to another an apprehended evil, of which, from the power of circumstances, he may not be duly aware, is no breach of charity, provided it be done in a spirit of meekness, and with the truest regard to the spiritual interests of the party concerned. “It is never allowable,” says Swedenborg, “for one man to judge of another as to the quality of his spiritual life, for the Lord alone knows this ; *yet it is allowable for every one to judge of another’s quality as to moral and civil life, for this is of concern to society.*” The operation of this principle is independent of geographical limits. The laws of Christian brotherhood ignore all local relations, as spiritual things lie without the conditions of space. Wherever there is *occasion* for the exercise of Christian offices to a brother or a neighbor, there is the *warrant* for it, and there is a violence done to the spirit of charity to visit the good act with censure. The fact is, no one who is in earnest in the work of regeneration desires *to be let alone* of those who can in any way contribute to his spiritual advancement, whether by pointing out his evils, or helping him to put them away. All that he requires is, that the office rendered shall be one of sincerity and kindness, as well as of fidelity—the

product of unfeigned neighborly love. True, a man is liable to be mistaken in his judgment of what is really evil on the part of the neighbor, and he is bound to guard, with the utmost care, against rashness of decision in pronouncing upon the moral, civil, or social life of the neighbor; but when he has pondered it with all the deliberation and candor in his power, and yet is unable to avoid the conclusion that a positive evil exists, he is most unquestionably at liberty to state his impression fairly and emphatically, and provided the statement is made without wrath or bitterness, without personal regards, but purely from the love of goodness and truth, it is a positive offence against charity to resent such a course as the officious intermeddling of "a busy-body in other men's matters." The very prompting to put this sinister aspect upon it is itself an evil, whatever may be the case in the original instance, and perhaps the inference is not wholly unfair that the evil of condemnation in this case is a proof of the evil of life in question; for otherwise why should the attempted conscientious discharge of a duty of charity provoke an ill construction and a denial of all right of judgment in the premises? May there not be a Christian duty of charity founded upon the precept, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor; and not suffer sin upon him," where the true force of the original term is to convince or convict of wrongs by reasoning or argument; or, as the Greek has it, "Thou shalt convincingly or demonstratively reprove thy neighbor." The general import of the precept is, "Thou shalt not suffer thy neighbor to go on in sin by neglecting to inform him of it; thou shalt not leave him under the evil of sin unreprieved." We here repeat our admission, that a man designing to act on this injunction may mistake in his judgment of the facts in the case; but we insist that no territorial or political considerations can justly bring this conduct under the charge of "unjustifiable interference." It is a charge that we are surprised to see brought by a Newchurchman, as it cannot at all stand the test of even a slight cross-questioning.



We might here advert to another consideration, in which we find an ample warrant for the so-called intermeddling of which our correspondent complains. The slavery question *does* concern the North as well as the South, inasmuch as it is recognized in the Constitution of our common country; and so far as the enacted laws of the land can avail to *nationalize* the system, they do it, thus creating in some sense a general participation on the part of every state and every citizen in the Union, in whatever evil may adhere to it. May we not, in these circumstances, discuss the moral character of a system, which in our eyes is fraught with multitudinous evils, by which we deem ourselves oppressed, and which we would invoke the co-operation of our Southern brethren to remove, if possible, from off the bosom of our beloved country? But upon this head we will not now enlarge, as it trenches upon the political aspects of the question, which we design to avoid. Our brethren, however, can perhaps conceive how exceeding strange must appear to us the virtual intimation that we have no *right* to discuss or agitate the subject. We fear that Northern men generally will be very slow to learn the indicated lesson of submission on this score. Certainly a mind thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the New Church will find in itself a signal incapacity to bow in silence to such a behest.

But we have already said more than we intended at the outset of our reply. What Shakspeare terms "the intellect of the letter" is doubtless too plain to be misunderstood. We feel in our heart of hearts the piercing of the pang which attends the consciousness of the alienated respect, esteem, and confidence of our Southern brethren. We do not forego them because we think lightly of them. Nor in fact do we feel that in the sight of Heaven we have given or shall give any sufficient reason for the estrangement. We have the inward assurance that we are at this moment as genuinely worthy their kind and affectionate sentiments as we ever were, since a common faith brought us into fraternal relations. We have done

them no wrong; we have done the truth no wrong; we have done the spirit of charity no wrong. But we cannot be ignorant that the peculiar sensitiveness of the Southern temperament cannot well brook the inquest which we propose to institute on the moral character of slavery. Even the begun process of regeneration does not at once lift them so far above the *natural* prejudices by which they are surrounded that they can look with tolerance upon the free questioning of a system which is inwrought into the very frame-work of their society, and the touching of which is touching the apple of their eye. For ourselves, under the consciousness of meaning no ill, and of simply discharging a Christian duty, we should be most happy to remain in the possession of their good graces; but if fidelity to our sacred convictions enforce the sacrifice, it must be made. Between the claims of truth and the demands of friendship we cannot waver. Though it be like cutting off a right hand, or plucking out a right eye, we must e'en submit to the sundering of soul which adherence to apprehended right draws after it. We shall look upon it as one of the severe but inevitable trials which our own regeneration involves—grieved, indeed, that the necessity of it should exist, but happy in the reflection that no moral obliquity on our part, and no real ground of offence, has been its procuring cause.

## PSEUDO-SPIRITUALISM.

[N. C. Repository, July to December, 1852.]

- 1.—The Philosophy of Spiritual Intercourse; being an Explanation of Modern Mysteries. By Andrew Jackson Davis. New York: Fowlers & Wells. 1851.
- 2.—The Great Harmonia. Vol. III., The Secr. By Andrew Jackson Davis. Boston: Mussey. 1852.
- 3.—History of the strange Sounds or Rappings, heard in Rochester and Western New York, and usually called the Mysterious Noises, which are supposed by many to be the Communications from the Spiritual World; together with all the Explanation that can as yet be given of the Matter. Rochester: D. M. Dewey. 1850.
- 4.—The Signs of the Times; comprising a History of the Spirit Rappings in Cincinnati and other Places; with Notes of Clairvoyant Revelments. By Wm. T. Coggshall. Cincinnati: Bagley & Freeman. 1851.
- 5.—Elements of Spiritual Philosophy; being an Exposition of Interior Principles. Written by Spirits of the Sixth Circle; R. P. Ambler, Medium. New York: R. P. Ambler. 1852.
- 6.—Familiar Spirits, and Spiritual Manifestations; being a Series of Articles by E. P. Supposed Dr. Enoch Pond, Professor in the Bangor Theological Seminary. Together with a Reply, by Veriphilos Credens. Boston: Bela Marsh. 1852.
- 7.—Voices from the Spirit World; being Communications from many Spirits, by the hand of Isaac Post, Medium. Rochester: 1852.
- 8.—Light from the Spirit World; comprising a series of Articles on the condition of Spirits, and Development of Mind in the rudimental and second Spheres. Being written wholly by the control of Spirits, without Volition or Will by the Medium, or any Thought or Care in regard to the Matter presented by his Hand. C. Hammond, Medium. Rochester: 1852.
- 9.—The Pilgrimage of Thomas Paine, and others, to the Seventh Circle in the Spirit World. Rev. Charles Hammond, Medium. Rochester: Dewey. 1852.
- 10.—Lectures on Spiritualism; being a Series of Lectures on the Phenomena and Philosophy of Development, Individualism, Spirit,

- Immortality, Mesmerism, Clairvoyance, Spiritual Manifestations, Christianity, and Progress. By J. Tiffany. Cleveland, Ohio. 1852.
- 11.—*Philosophy of Modern Miracles, or the Relations of Spiritual Causes to Physical Effects*; with especial reference to the Developments at Bridgeport, Conn., and elsewhere. By a "Dweller in the Temple." New York. 1850.
  - 12.—*An Exposition and Explanation of the Modern Manifestations*; comprising the Rappings, Movements, Writing Mediums, and various other Phenomena connected therewith; with extracts from different writers, of remarkable Instances of Presentiment, Prophesying, Visions, Clairvoyance, &c. &c. By Benjamin Franklin Cooley, the great Psychologist, and Independent Clairvoyant. Springfield, Mass. 1852.
  - 13.—*Spiritual Philosopher* (subsequently the *Spirit World*), devoted to the Exposition of Nature, Physical, Spiritual, and Divine, and to communications from the Spirit World. A weekly paper, edited by La Roy Sunderland. Boston. 1850-1. (Discontinued.)
  - 14.—*The Shekinah*; a Quarterly Review, devoted to the Emancipation of Mind; the Elucidation of Vital, Mental, and Spiritual Phenomena, and the Progress of Man. Conducted by S. B. Brittan. Nos. 1, 2, 3. Bridgeport. Conn. 1852.
  - 15.—*The Spirit Messenger*; a Semi-monthly Magazine, devoted to Spiritual Science, the Elucidation of Truth, and the Progress of Mind. Edited by the Spirits of the Sixth Circle; R. P. Ambler, Medium. Springfield, Mass., and New York. 1851-2.
  - 16.—*Spiritual Telegraph*; devoted to the Illustration of Spiritual Intercourse. Published weekly by Charles Partridge. New York. 1852.
  - 17.—*The Crisis*; devoted to building up the Lord's Church in true Life, Doctrine, and Order. A semi-monthly paper, edited by Rev. Henry Weller. Laporte, Ind. 1852.
  - 18.—*Disclosures from the Interior, and Superior Care for Mortals*. A semi-monthly paper, dictated by Apostles, Prophets, and other Spirits. Auburn, N. Y. 1851.
  - 19.—*Spiritual and Moral Instructor*. Semi-monthly. Auburn, N. Y. 1851. (Discontinued.)
  - 20.—*History of the Origin of All Things, including the History of Man, from his Creation to his Finality, but not to his End*. Written by God's holy Spirits, through an earthly Medium, L. M. Arnold, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Printed at his expense, published by direction of the Spirits, and, in God's will, submitted to a holy and searching Criticism from every earnest Seeker after Truth. For sale by all Booksellers who desire to forward the Work of God's Redemption of man from Ignorance, Fear, and torturing Doubt. Amen. In the year of God's grace, 1852.

- 21.—Observations on the Theological Mystery ; the Harmonial Philosophy, and Spirit Rappings ; with an Appendix concerning Freemasonry. By the Author of " Millennial Institutions and the Seventh Seal." Hartford, Conn. 1851.
- 22.—Open Intercourse with the Spiritual World ; its Dangers, and the Cautions which they naturally suggest. By B. F. Barrett. Boston. 1845.
- 23.—A History of the recent Developments in Spiritual Manifestations in the city of Philadelphia ; by a Member of the first Circle, instituted in the month of October, 1850. Philadelphia : G. S. Harris. 1851.
- 24.—Spiritual Instructions, received at one of the Circles formed in Philadelphia for the purpose of investigating the Philosophy of Spiritual Intercourse. Published for the benefit of the Harmonial Benevolent Association. Philadelphia : A. Comfort. 1852.
- 25.—Spiritual Experience of Mrs. Lorin P. Platt, of Newtown, Conn., with Spiritual Impressions annexed. Written while subjected to the Influence of a Circle of Spirits, with directions to publish to the World. New Haven : H. B. Benham. 1852.
- 26.—Mental Alchemy : A Treatise on the Mind, Nervous System, Psychology, Magnetism, Mesmerism, and Diseases. In twelve chapters. By B. Brown Williams, M. D. New York : Fowlers & Wells. 1852.
- 27.—The Approaching Crisis ; being a review of Dr. Bushnell's recent Lectures on Supernaturalism. By Andrew Jackson Davis. New York : Redfield, and others. 1852.
- 28.—An Exposition of the Views respecting the principal Facts, Causes, and Peculiarities involved in Spirit Manifestations ; together with interesting Phenomena, Statements, and Communications. By Adin Ballou. Boston : B. Marsh. 1852.
- 29.—Philosophy of Mysterious Agents, Human and Mundane ; or the Dynamic Laws and Relations of Man ; embracing the Natural Philosophy of Phenomena, styled " Spiritual Manifestations." By E. C. Rogers. In Five Numbers. No. I. Boston : Redding & Co. 1852.

It will surprise us if a large portion of our readers is *not* surprised at the above array of works recently accumulated in the department of Spiritualism so called. They cannot well but wonder that a new literature, if not a new science, has sprung into being with those singular physical developments that, within a few years, have so startled the repose of a sensuous scepticism, by bringing the world of spirits into close proximity with

the world of matter. It is mainly with the view of making our readers acquainted with the fact of these numerous issues of the press, bearing upon the so-termed spiritual manifestations, that we have cited the above long roll of titles. We have no design of a formal review, or a specific account of the contents of any of them. They are of various value, from zero upwards and downwards. Admitting the authenticity of the narratives, it would be difficult to conceive anything more intrinsically trifling and insipid than the communications professedly derived from many of these tenants of the higher spheres. If such a thing as "spiritual twaddle" could be predicated or imagined of the spiritual world, we should have no farther to seek for the appropriate term by which to characterize a large portion of these ghostly utterances. Of others of them we should be bound in justice to give a somewhat more favorable character. But of none of them can we say that they are of any special importance to any; while to the man of the New Church, they are, the very best of them, mere lispings, babblings, and badinage. That oracles of more moment are sometimes uttered in private circles we are inclined to believe; but taking the published documents as a specimen, we can say of them little else than that "it needed no ghost to tell us that."

The subject, however, with all its abatements, is one of curious interest, and worthy the reflections and remarks which we purpose to bestow upon it. It is one which is pressing itself upon the attention of the public with great urgency at the present time, and from its bordering so closely upon the domain of the New Church, comes very legitimately within its survey. We are aware that there is in many quarters a strong impression that the man of the New Church is to keep himself entirely aloof from all contact with these phenomena; that he cannot approach them even for the purpose of investigation, without contracting a soil upon the purity of his spirit, or giving countenance to magical and diabolical proceedings; and that, therefore, our true motto is,

"Touch not, taste not, handle not." "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united." For ourselves, however, we are but little troubled with scruples on this head. We recognize an astounding marvel in these spiritual manifestations, amply deserving the study of every enlightened mind. Nor do we know anything in the drift of the New Church teachings which would forbid the examination of natural or supernatural phenomena, because we might thereby stumble a weak brother or sister. It is only by becoming thoroughly acquainted with the manifestations in all their phases that we shall be best enabled to detect and expose their falsities and evils. To one who has paid much attention to the subject, nothing is more obvious than that Swedenborg figures largely in the alleged communications from the world of spirits. He is often referred to as a highly advanced spirit, sojourning in some of the supernal spheres, and a great master in all the mysteries of spirit-lore, but still so presented to view, as greatly to mislead those who have been hitherto strangers to his true character and his real mission. The mirror by which he is reflected in these revelations is one of such a waving and rugged surface that the image is awfully distorted. So far then as it is proper to correct erroneous impressions on this score, in behalf of the interests of the New Church, so far we think it incumbent on the advocate of our truths to acquaint himself with the phases of this singular demonstration. In like manner, if anything of a confirmatory character is to be drawn from this source, we know of thing to prevent our drawing it. It is from motives of this nature that we have given considerable attention to the subject, not as a pupil sitting at the feet of rapping Gamaliels, but as a judge deciding upon the evidence and bearing of a peculiar order of physical facts. Our present object is to state in brief some of the results of our inquisition; and

1. We have become satisfied of the reality of the phenomena; that is to say, that they are not the product

of fraud, collusion, legerdemain, or human contrivance of any kind. We are convinced that they are of a veritably preternatural origin. No theory of slight-of-hand or slight-of-foot will account for all the facts which are daily and hourly occurring in nearly every part of the country. To say nothing of the rigid scrutiny to which the whole matter has been subjected in the presence of the most intelligent and competent committees; nothing of the vast multiplication of mediums over the land, of many of whom the suspicion of trickery could not for a moment be entertained; what more incredible than that little children, in some cases, of not more than two or three years of age, should become parties to a stupendous scheme of deception, extended and ramified in a thousand directions, from one end of the Union to the other? What, again, shall be thought of the fact of which we are personally cognizant, that communications have been made in the Hebrew, Arabic, Sanscrit, and other languages; and that, too, under circumstances which absolutely forbid the supposition of any other than supernatural agency? We regard it, in fact, as entirely impossible to evade the proof that there are certain organizations or temperaments which enable those that possess them to become mediums of intelligent intercourse between the natural and spiritual planes of existence, and that such intercourse is daily being had in hundreds of circles formed for the purpose among all classes of the community.

2. The fact of these manifestations is in itself a very wonderful fact. We speak more especially of the table-knocking or table-tipping phenomena. Those attending the writing mediums are less impressive, as it is easier to refer them, in part at least, to a merely natural origin. One cannot be quite sure that the mind of the medium does not govern the responses. But to sit with a company around a table, and to have an undoubting assurance that there is an invisible power producing the mysterious sounds or motions, and to have the clearest evidence also of intelligence as well as power—to put inter-



rogations, and have them distinctly and pertinently answered by a presence veiled from mortal view—to have the signal call for the alphabet given, and sentence after sentence slowly spelt out, indicating a perfect knowledge of the conversation going on in the circle, and interposing pertinent remarks, counsels, cautions, denials, qualifications, confirmations, informations, as the case may require, and yet the senses taking no cognizance of any persons speaking besides those who you are sure do not speak—all this, it must be confessed, is marvellous exceedingly when compared with the hitherto established course of human experience. We know, indeed, that this mode of manifestation by the rapping, or rocking, or removal of tables, not only stumbles faith, but provokes ridicule, with the mass of worldly men, as something utterly beneath the dignity of the dwellers of the spiritual spheres. Even those who ordinarily evince but precious little solicitude as to the estimate which may be formed of spirits, of their occupation, enjoyments, or ruling springs of action, become exceedingly jealous of their good repute and worthy proceedings when such a mode of physical agency is attributed to them. They seem to think it as much beneath their dignity to *move* tables, as it was deemed unbecoming to the chosen twelve in the primitive Christian church to “*serve* tables.” But it is certainly a very appropriate inquiry whether, supposing that a physical demonstration of any kind were to be made, what more convenient or satisfactory method could be adopted for the purpose. If such demonstrations be made in a house, and not out of doors, it would seem that *some* articles of furniture would be brought into requisition, and we think it would be difficult to suggest anything more suitable for the nonce than tables. The great fact to be established in the matter is the fact that spirits do really communicate with men on earth. The intrinsic nature of the oracles uttered is something of less moment. They may be true or false, but the great point is whether they *are* at all. There is no species of information to be derived from the supernal

abodes of so much importance to the world as the bare fact that spirits do and can communicate; and this fact could not well be established by any other than evidence addressed to the outward senses, especially with a world immersed in sensuous thought. The chosen mode, therefore, is probably as appropriate as any that could be adopted, considering the prevalent states of those for whom they are providentially designed.

So far as the simple *modus operandi* of the agency is concerned in producing the mysterious sounds, and acting upon material substances, we are forced to admit that it is difficult to find anything in the writings of Swedenborg which affords an adequate solution of the problem. It appears to be a form of spiritual agency with which he was not made acquainted, and which may possibly be at this day as great a novelty in the world of spirits as in our own. But, however this may be, it is certain, we think, that in the other department of the manifestations, the intelligence that receives and responds to the various interrogatories proposed, the New Church does shed a flood of light upon the subject. It acquaints us with the fact that the world unseen is peopled with myriads of spirits, who, being in fallacies and falsities themselves, cannot for this reason be reliable mediums of truth to others. Not that *every thing* which emanates from them is necessarily evil and false, for there is evidently a mixture of the good and the true in their communications; but what we would say is, that their reports and responses cannot be relied upon, just as we would say of a mendacious man, in this world, that though he might sometimes tell the truth, yet still he was not a reliable man. So of these "rapping spirits;" though sometimes true, they very frequently give information that is utterly delusive and false, and he who confides in them is sadly in danger of being grievously misled.

Now the Newchurchman by being forewarned is forearmed on this head. He has been instructed in the fact, not only that we are every moment surrounded by and embosomed in the midst of countless thousands of intel-

ligent beings, but that these beings having all passed from the earth into the spiritual sphere, are there distinguished by the dominant character which they bore in the body, and that consequently in proportion to the degree of falsity and evil that had obtained ascendancy during their earthly sojourn is the prevalence of the same principles in the sphere to which they were now transferred. Such a man, therefore, will be on his guard against giving heed to these alleged oracles from the other world. "In vain is the net spread in sight of any bird." Although he is willing to admit the fact of the opening of some kind of intercourse at the present day between the outer and the inner spheres, yet he will not commit himself to the information thence derived, because he is taught to believe that falsity is the rule and truth the exception in all such communications. Viewed in the light of the New Church, these so called "manifestations" assume a character very different from that in which they would be apt to be regarded by minds less instructed in the laws and workings of the spiritual world. The intelligent man of the New Dispensation, while he concedes the spiritual origin of these revelations—spiritual, we mean, as contradistinguished from physical—cannot yet but tremble at the results which may flow from them. The danger in his estimate, arises from the likelihood of their being made an oracle for the information of mankind on the great truths pertaining to the other world, and a guide to duty and action in this. The thing is so astounding—it is a phenomenon so far superior, at first blush, to the tame revelation recorded in a book—it carries with it an air so imposing and authentic, that we cannot wonder that, with the worldly and the sensual, it should have a tendency to supersede all other modes of revelation, and to throw the Divine Word, with all its sacred dicta and hallowed associations, into the background. If such a one obtains a response from a spirit relative to any important point proposed, what more natural than that he should rest in it as conclusive, notwithstanding it should, perchance, go

directly counter to Holy Writ. Will he not be prone to say, "I have a higher authority than that of any written record. I have a voice direct from the spirit-world itself. Is not this the head-quarters of truth? Do I need any other Urim and Thummim than this? The Bible and Swedenborg may do for those who are aware of no brighter light; but they belong to another and a by-gone or by-going Dispensation. A new era is being ushered in. A 'purer ray serene' is beaming from the inner heavenly sanctuary upon the outer earthly court, and I, for one, am prepared to rejoice in its coming—the coming of a day which shall dispel the brooding shadows of the long night that has preceded."

This is the danger which we apprehend—and it is one which calls for wise words of counsel from all those who have been taught in some good measure to discriminate between the spirit of truth and the spirit of error—the two spirits that are now abroad in the earth. The needed antidote to the bane, we are persuaded, is to be found in the disclosures of the New Church, and in them alone. The man of that church is upon a plane from which he can look down upon the whole field of development below. Judged himself by nothing inferior, he judges all by virtue of his position. As, therefore, he is for the most part exempt from the perils that are imminent over others, so he has but little *personal* interest in any abnormal manifestations of this nature; for what has he to gain by them? As to new information from the spiritual world, new light cast upon its facts and laws, he smiles at the idea of accessions to his knowledge from this source. And as to the general claims and assumptions of the New Church, he sees quite as little ground for indebtedness as in anything else. He needs no confirmation from this source of the truths of the New dispensation, or of the mission of its herald. Suppose ever so emphatic a response to assure him that Swedenborg was a faithful legate of heaven, and that all that he has promulgated in the name of the Lord is true. What then? How much would this add to his present convictions on

this score? Does he not believe all this already, and upon much higher authority—that of rational and moral evidence? Is he not conscious that his faith is founded upon principles inlaid in the very ground-work of his being? But suppose, on the other hand, the rapping response should deny this, and declare that Swedenborg had merely given forth the vagaries of his own brain as celestial verities? Would this have any effect upon him? Would he not at once pronounce it a lie, and adjudge that spirit to hell, the abode of lies, and of the father of lies? And suppose that rappings as loud as the seven thunders of the Apocalypse should be heard in confirmation of the denial, would he not still brand it as an infernal falsity?

It is not then, we repeat, the man of the New Church who is likely to be harmed, as he certainly will not be benefited, by this form of spiritual manifestation. It is another class entirely who bid fair to become victims to delusions from this source—a class composed of those who are addicted to a so-called spiritualism, which might as well be termed marvel-mongering, and who are yet so little principled in genuine truth as to be unable to discriminate between what bears the stamp of heaven, and what is marked with the impress of the pit. Such persons encountering an order of phenomena so novel, so strange, and yet sustained by such an overwhelming array of proof, are easily led to yield to them an unbounded credence. The developments come in such plausible guise, they urge and insinuate themselves with such a mighty power of persuasion, that nothing is more natural than that the natural man should be taken captive by them. The resisting force in his mind is not adequate to stem the torrent of subtle influences which from this quarter pour themselves in upon him.

For this reason we are compelled, therefore, to regard this whole order of phenomena as likely to prove the occasion of one of the most solemn and momentous trials or probations that has ever befallen the human race; and as the thing bids fair to spread and to engulf the credu-

lity of thousands, we cannot but apply to all such as keep aloof from the peril, the words of the Lord to the Church of Philadelphia :—" Because thou has kept the word of my patience, I will also keep thee from the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." Nor is it a suggestion of slight import in this connexion that in matters of this kind where men abandon themselves to those lights which " lead to bewilder and dazzle to blind," the Lord himself may " choose their delusions," or, in other words, so order the issues of His Providence that those who are prompted to forsake His guidance shall be borne onward in a stream of phantasies wearing so much the garb of truth that they shall be " snared and taken, and shall fall backward." A judicial lot shall be theirs.

" Hear the just law, the judgment of the skies ;  
He that hates truth shall be the dupe of lies,  
And he that will be cheated to the last,  
Delusions strong as hell shall hold him fast."

This is in strict accordance with the tenor of the Holy Word as communicated to the Prophet Ezekiel :

" And the word of the Lord came unto me saying, Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their heart, and put the stumbling-block of their iniquity before their face ; should I be inquired of at all by them ? Therefore speak unto them, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God : Every man of the house of Israel that setteth up his idols in his heart, and putteth the stumbling-block of his iniquity before his face, and cometh to the prophet ; *I the Lord will answer him that cometh according to the multitude of his idols* ; that I may take the house of Israel in their own heart, because they are all estranged from me through their idols."

Idols, in the spiritual sense, are false doctrines or pre-conceived notions derived from man's self-intelligence, and we have here the fearful intimation that according to these pre-adopted falsities will be the responses palmed upon him.

There is, therefore, but one point of view in which the New Churchman can look with complacency upon these

abnormal outbreaks from the world of spirits—and that is as affording a species of proof of the existence of a peopled world of intelligence by which we are constantly surrounded, that shall stimulate curiosity to explore the writings of the New Church, and thus open a door of entrance to its sublime truths and its genuine goods. It is in the New Church alone that we see an ark of safety to the poor souls that are otherwise in danger of being swallowed up in the floods and maelstroms of delusion that are now yawning for victims.

In the admission above made, of the reality of the phenomena embraced under the general head of “spirit manifestations”—in conceding that they are not the product of fraud, collusion, legerdemain, or human contrivance of any kind—that they are of a veritable preternatural (we do not say *supernatural*) origin; we do not consider ourselves as precluded from admitting, at the same time, that some of these phenomena are intrinsically susceptible of solution on merely natural principles. As the forms of these manifestations exhibit a vast variety, it is certainly possible that some of them may be due to causes short of spiritual agency, or, in other words, short of the agency of disembodied spirits. There may be laws of man’s physical or psychical economy, or of both combined, of which we have been hitherto ignorant, capable of producing *some* of the effects that are witnessed in these developments. There may be, for ought we know, unconscious emanations and operations of the hidden dynamics of our being that have all the semblance of effects produced by the conscious volition of an intelligent spirit. This, we say, *may* be the fact, although we are not aware that any adequate proof has been adduced that it *is* so, and we have ourselves witnessed numerous experiments that could not, by any possibility, be accounted for on this hypothesis. But even granting it to be true, it is a question whether it does not involve principles and powers in solving the phenomena which tax credulity quite as much as their reference to purely spiritual agents. The unconscious

projection of electrical currents from the brain of sufficient force to move heavy tables, and to move them too, in such a way, as to respond negatively or affirmatively, to questions proposed, many of them mental questions, is certainly a phenomenon that staggers the conception about as much as the direct reference of the effects to the action of spirits that have left the flesh. Yet if any one imagines that he saves the credit of his philosophy by this mode of explanation, and finds the ground of the facts sufficiently covered by it, we at least shall not disturb him in the easy-chair repose of his theory.

But it is not a solution that satisfies us. We are disposed, or rather forced, to fall back on the theory of intelligent spiritual agency exerted by dwellers within the veil, through peculiar human organizations, upon material substances in the natural world. Still, no one who receives the teachings of the New Church will believe that such effects are produced by spirits without the intermediation of certain latent powers by which the spiritual acts upon the natural world. On this head the language of Swedenborg is very express :

“ Man derives to himself, *from the inmost principles of nature*, a medium between what is spiritual and what is natural. . . . Hereby also spirits and angels can be adjoined and conjoined to the human race ; for there is conjunction, and where there is conjunction, there must be also a medium ; that there is such a medium the angels know, but whereas *it is from the inmost principles of nature*, and the expressions of all languages are from its ultimates, it can only be described by things abstract.”—*Concern. Div. Wis.* VIII.

These “inmost principles of nature” are undoubtedly such imponderables as electricity, magnetism, the Odic force of Reichenbach, &c., without which we have no reason to suppose that spirits ever attempt to operate upon matter. We have probably an allusion to the same subtle elements in the following paragraphs :

“ Every man after death puts off the natural, which he had from the mother, and retains the spiritual, which he had from the father, together with a kind of border (or circumambient accretion) *from the purest things of nature*, around it ; but this border, with those who come into heaven, is below, and the spiritual above, but that border with those



who come into hell, is above and the spiritual below. Thence it is that a man-angel speaks from heaven, thus what is good and true ; but that a man-devil speaks from hell, while from his heart, and, as it were, from heaven, while from his mouth ; he does this abroad, but that at home."—*T. C. R.* 103.

"The natural mind of man consists both of spiritual and natural substances ; from its spiritual substances, thought is produced, but not from its natural substances, the latter substances recede, when a man dies, but not the spiritual substances ; hence, the same mind, after death, when a man becomes a spirit or angel, remains in a form like what it had in the world. The natural substances of that mind, which, as has been said, recede by death, constitute the cutaneous covering of the spiritual body of spirits and angels ; by means of this covering, which is taken from the natural world, their spiritual bodies subsist ; for the natural is the ultimate continent ; hence, there is no spirit or angel, who was not born a man."—*D. L. & W.* 257.

From these extracts it appears that spirits in the other life are still connected by a subtle bond with the natural world, and it is a fair inference that it is by means of this connecting medium that the physical effects manifested in so many quarters at the present day are produced. As to the precise *mode* in which the effects take place, it may not be possible for us at present to determine it, nor can we, perhaps, fully assure ourselves that it is not a comparatively recent discovery with spirits themselves.

It will be observed, however, that in the passage from the *T. C. R.* there is something peculiarly significant in what is said of the relative position or seat of these "natural substances" in the good and the evil. In the former they are below, i. e., subjected and subordinate to the spiritual, while in the latter the order is reversed, and evil spirits in consequence have more facility in coming in contact with the natural sphere than have the good. It seems also to be implied that on this account whatever communications are made by spirits of this class have externally the guise of truth, while, at the same time, the prompting source within is in association with hell. We are not entirely certain of having rightly construed this passage, but our impression is strong that,

duly apprehended, it discloses some very important information bearing upon the subject before us. On this subject our object now is to state, in continuance, the result of our investigations, and we accordingly remark:

3. That these alleged spiritual communications not only do not impart any important truth, but they abound with the grossest falsities. We should perhaps do injustice to the "circles," and their invisible presidents, to say that the staple of their communications was made up of positive errors, for the main material, as far as we have observed, consists of little more than a vein of vapid truisms, or a kind of sentimental moralizing, with a marvellously scanty infusion of new ideas, and with next to no element at all of spiritual power or even attraction. But, beside this, we do find every now and then the peering forth of direct and palpable falsities, which, however, are not so easy of detection, except to one conversant with the revelations vouchsafed to the man of the New Church. Of this class are the representations almost invariably made respecting Swedenborg and his revelations. With scarcely an exception that has ever come to our knowledge, they speak substantially the language of the following extract, professing to be a communication from his spirit through a medium in which "he recognizes a reflecting mirror of his inmost thoughts."

"I wish to say to the world that the writings which were published while I was yet an inhabitant of earth, contain many important errors, while they reveal much important truth; that the beauties of the celestial world were unknown to my imprisoned spirit as they are now presented to my view; that the sweetness and purity which pervade all the glorious mansions of eternal life, were entirely unappreciated by the writer of many books; that the grandeur and sublimity of the expanding heavens—the happiness and refinement which are breathed into the deepest heart of the soul—the brightness and attraction which call the spirit ever onward and upward, were wholly lost to the darkened mind which once groped amid the shadows of theological error. But in the transition which has taken place in my position, and the transformation which has passed over my entire being, are the influences which have introduced me to a loftier eminence of spiritual life—a nobler expansion of the interior vision, and a more truthful conception of celestial realities. Hence I am now prepared to speak

of those things at present, which I could not have comprehended while in the body; and hence I now discover the use, the benefit, and the blessing of spiritual manifestations as I could not have done in my connection with the earthly form.

"The spirit wishes to say that he is pleased to unfold to the world the knowledge which he has obtained, and that he can assure the individuals whom he may address, that the revealments which are now made by him are reliable in the most literal sense. He has seen that the world has looked at the manifestations of spiritual presence with emotions of blind and almost stupid wonderment: that it has regarded every occurrence of this character as necessarily opposed to the established laws of Nature and utterly inconsistent with the revelations of former ages; that the beauty of spiritual truth has thus been overlooked and despised in the uncontrolled devotion to human creeds, and that the blessings which such truth is adapted to bring to the earth-bound soul have been disregarded and rejected. In this dark and repelling atmosphere, where doubt, and, fear, and ignorance are constantly making their gloom felt by the soul, I would introduce some small portion of spiritual light that the eyes of the spirit may not be entirely destitute of that soothing and invigorating element which it so really needs."—*Spirit Messenger*, Feb., 1852.

"If thou art he, alas, how fallen!" To say nothing of the absurd intimation that the brightness and attraction of heaven were wholly lost to his darkened mind while "groping amid the shadows of theological error"—that is, during his abode on earth—how ridiculous the idea that the vigorous and massive sense of the great hierophant should ever lapse down to such puling mawkishness as we read in this paragraph. If a counterfeit presentment is to be recognized in the case, the personation is a miserable failure, and the spirits above must have a very poor opinion of the discernment of the spirits on the earth to suppose that they could be misled by such abortive mimicry.

The following excerpt from the vision of Judge Edmonds, published in the *Shekinah* (No. III.) comes into the same category. After relating the appearance to him of Wm. Penn and Sir Isaac Newton, he proceeds:

"Swedenborg then appeared and said to me that in his revelations of what he had seen, he was right and truthful and to be relied upon, but not in the theory which he had built upon them; and especially

he mentioned his doctrine of correspondences, and his attempt to reconcile his revelations with the popular religion of his day. And he said, as the Bible contained many important and valuable truths, yet being written in and for an unprogressing age, it contained errors and imperfections; so his theological writings contained many valuable truths, as well as some errors, produced by his desire to reconcile the truths which were unfolded to him with the prevailing theology of his age. He bade us beware of his errors, to receive as true his revelations, but discard his theories, and instead of them to appeal to our own understandings for the inferences to be drawn from the truths he had developed."

We should feel for ourselves great difficulty to condense into the same compass the same amount of false statement—due to the spirits of course, if they uttered it—which we encounter in these few lines. In the first place, the distinction here adverted to between Swedenborg's "revelations" and his "theories" is totally gratuitous and groundless. He has built no theories upon his asserted facts. He does not deal in theories. The mission intrusted to him was of a nature to forbid the introduction of any speculations of his own. What Judge Edmonds would call "theories," are among the authoritative announcements which he makes of the laws and principles that prevail in the Lord's universe, and he states them as facts and not as inferences. Again, it is impossible that he should have said anything that would imply the unsoundness of his doctrine of correspondences in any respect, for this is the grand theme of his revelations, which the Judge says we are to receive. The doctrine of correspondences is the discovery to the world of the relation subsisting between the natural and the spiritual spheres, and without this discovery, Swedenborg's revelations might as well not have been. If Judge E. had been at all adequately acquainted with Swedenborg's works he would have been able at once to brand such an insinuation as an outrageous falsity. Once more, it is a falsity equally gross that Swedenborg sought to reconcile his revelations with the popular theology of his age. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Never was there a more emphatic repudiation, a

more point-blank disclaimer, of an erroneous system of dogmas than he has proclaimed to all generations of men. Let any intelligent man acquaint himself with what Swedenborg has taught on the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Redemption, Regeneration, the Word, Faith, Charity, Good Works, Freewill, Repentance, Heaven and Hell, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, &c., and then pronounce whether he was a man "to trim his way to seek love"—whether he has any where shown a temporizing and conciliating policy, as if desirous to keep in favor with the ruling theology, while at the same time he was consciously uttering truths which went directly to overthrow the entire system of the old schools. We have high respect for Judge E. in his judicial capacity, and we should like to have his keen power of analysis brought to bear from the bench upon such a tissue of fallacies as seems to have been imposed upon him in this visionary fabrication.

We have cited the above as specimens of their class. *Ex hoc disce omnes*, and their name is legion. These wonderful revelators from the "sixth circle" downwards, are perpetually prating of the errors of Swedenborg's writings, and yet they take good care never to specify or hint what they are, so that the charge can be directly and distinctly met. It would seem beyond question that these communicating spirits, as a general fact, have some special reasons for dealing in disparaging insinuations in regard to Swedenborg, while at the same time, as if not to shock too severely the estimate in which they know he is held, they interlard their discourses with patronising compliments which would create an impression that he is still, with all his faults, a *Magnus Apollo* to them also, as he is to many that are, as they say, "yet in the form."

But it is not simply the person of Swedenborg which many of their reports misrepresent; his doctrines also are discredited, as far as can be done by the inculcation of doctrines directly the reverse of his.

Among the most striking phenomena connected with

the spirit manifestations is the linguistic writing of which some engraved specimens are to be seen in the "Shekinah" edited by Mr. Brittan. Sentences and paragraphs in Hebrew, Arabic, Sanscrit were mysteriously penned on paper, parchment, books, and even upon the walls of the room in which the medium lodged.

The history of this curious affair will be more interesting from the annexed correspondence respecting it, consisting of a letter from E. P. Fowler, the medium, and of one from ourself, written in compliance with a request from Mr. Brittan the Editor of the Shekinah. As the manuscript was submitted to our inspection, we had no objection to state the matters of fact which had come to our knowledge. We assume thereby no patronage of the marvel, which we choose to let stand or fall by its own merits.

*Editor of the Shekinah:*

DEAR SIR:—In pursuance of your request to communicate the facts of my experience, which relate to the origin of the writings, I submit the following brief statement: On the night of the 21st of November, 1851, while sleeping alone in the third story of the house, I was awakened about one o'clock, by sounds of footsteps in my room. Looking up, I saw five men, some of them dressed in ancient costume, walking about and conversing together. Some of them spoke with me, and among other things told me not to be frightened, that they would not harm me, &c. I attempted to rise, however, to go down stairs, but found that my limbs were paralyzed. These strange visitants remained with me about three hours, and finally disappeared while going toward a window, and when within about two feet of it. They did not open the window. During the succeeding night, and at about the same hour, I was again awakened in a similar manner, and saw several persons in my room. Some of those who were there on the previous night were present with others whom I had never seen before. One of them had what appeared to be a box about eighteen inches square, and some nine inches high; it seemed to contain electrical apparatus. They placed the box on the table, and then electrical emanations, like currents of light of different colors, were seen issuing from the box. One of the company placed a piece of paper, pen and ink on the lid of this box. The luminous currents now centered around the pen, which was immediately taken up and dipped in the ink, and without the application of any other force or instrument, so far as I could perceive, the pen was made to move across the paper

and a communication was made which I have since learned was in the Hebrew language. This information I received from Prof. Bush, to whom the writings were submitted for translation, and whose letter addressed to you will accompany this statement. Soon after three o'clock, my companions left me as they had done the previous night, taking the box with them. During the time they were in my apartment, I was in possession of my natural senses, and not only saw *them*, but the furniture in the room, by means of the illumination which their presence caused ; and I also heard the clock strike, and carriages passing in the street.

I have since witnessed many similar occurrences in which writing, said to be in the Hebrew, Arabic, Bengalee, and other languages, have, in like manner, been executed in my room. I only speak of the facts as disclosed to my senses : of the several languages referred to I know nothing.

Yours truly,

E. P. F.

NEW-YORK, March 26, 1852.

MR. BRITTAN—*Dear Sir* : In compliance with your request, I willingly make a statement respecting the several communications in Hebrew, Arabic, Bengalee, &c., which have been submitted to my inspection. In doing so you of course understand that I speak merely as the witness of certain facts, and not as the partisan advocate of any theory by which these and similar facts may be attempted to be accounted for.

The first of these manuscripts was in Hebrew, containing a few verses from the last chapter of the Prophet Daniel. This was correctly written, with the exception of several apparently arbitrary omissions, and one rather violent transposition of a word from an upper to a lower line. The next was from the book of Joel (Ch. ii. 23-27,) and was also correctly written, with one or two trifling errors, of such a nature, however, as would be very unlikely to be made either by one who understood the language, or by one who should undertake to transcribe the passage mechanically from Hebrew.

The other specimens were in the Hebrew, Arabic, and Bengalee languages, to which I may add a paragraph in French, written underneath the Bengalee, and apparently a translation of it. As this was from Joel ii. 28, 29, it could easily be verified by recurrence to a Bengalee version of the Scriptures in the library of the American Bible Society. The sentences in the Arabic character were also ascertained to be mostly translations of a few verses from the Arabic portion of the Scriptures. One of them, however, I am informed, was alleged by the spirits to be a quotation or translation of some lines from Pope. But how this is to be understood I know not.

The style of the manuscript is very peculiar. Whoever were the penmen, the act of writing seems to have been preceded by some preliminary flourishes of a very singular and zigzag appearance, com-

mening at or near the top of the page, and connecting with the first word of the script. In the case of one of the Arabic extracts, there were traces over the paper, which indicated that the pen for some reason was not raised during the writing; besides which the lines run diagonally across the sheet, and were followed by an imperfect sentence in English, terminating in the Arabic word signifying *end*. Altogether the specimens are of an extraordinary character, such as I cannot well convey by any verbal description.

As to the origin of the documents, I am not yet prepared to express an opinion. They come proximately from the hands of Mr. E. P. Fowler, a young gentleman with whom I had previously no acquaintance, but who, since I have become acquainted with him, does not at all impress me as one who would knowingly practice deception on others, however he might by possibility be imposed upon himself. He certainly has no knowledge of the above languages, nor do I think it likely that he is leagued in collusion with any one who has. A man who is versed in these ancient and oriental tongues, would be, I think, but little prone to lend himself as a party to a pitiful scheme of imposture. It must, indeed, be admitted to be possible that Mr. Fowler may himself have copied the extracts from printed books, but I can only say for myself that, from internal evidence, and from a multitude of collateral circumstances, I am perfectly satisfied that he never did it. But my conviction on this score will, of course, have very little weight with others, which, however, is a point of small consequence with me. In like manner, I am equally confident that he, though the medium on the occasion, had, consciously, nothing to do with a Hebrew communication which was spelled out to me in the presence of a circle of very respectable gentlemen, not one of whom, beside myself, had any knowledge of that language. In the present case the only alternative solution that occurs to me is, that it was either an unconscious feat of somnambulism, or that it was the veritable work of spirits, effected by some spiritual-natural dynamics in the manner he describes. Which is most probable, or what is more probable than either, your readers must decide for themselves.

Very respectfully yours, &c.,

G. BUSH.

NEW-YORK, March 27, 1852.

Now it must be admitted that this is a most extraordinary occurrence, view it how we may. It is marvellous if the writing was effected by spirits—marvellous if by young Fowler while in a somnabulic state—and marvellous not a little if executed by him in a waking and conscious state, inasmuch as his tastes, habits, pursuits, are all entirely foreign to oriental studies; and the following letter recently published in the “Spiritual Telegraph”



contains statements which go to render that supposition extremely incredible.

S. B. BRITTAN—*Dear Sir*: I have been solicited by a mutual friend to send you a concise statement of my experience, as connected with some mysterious writings which have occurred in my room, a *fac simile* of one of which appeared in No. 9 of the Spiritual Telegraph. I comply with the request, though in contrariety to my inclinations, which would prompt me to shrink from any publicity.

The original paper containing the autographs I found upon my table, about three o'clock one afternoon on my return from business; the paper used being a sheet of drawing-paper, which was incidentally left on my table, and which I am sure was blank when I left my room in the forenoon. The succeeding autographical manuscript, a representation of which was published, was executed in my room on a piece of parchment, left on my table, by direction of the spirits, for that purpose. This was written on during the night, while I was in my room asleep. I would add that many of the signatures on the parchment were entirely strange to me, having never seen them before.

I have also had several specimens of various oriental languages, written in my room, on paper, which I could identify as my own, though the languages were unknown to me. These have been written on, both when I have been in my room, and when I have been absent. Several of the languages referred to I had never seen prior to my acquaintance with them through these mystical manuscripts, and of course did not know what they were, until I had submitted them to a linguist, who read them with facility.

The first one which I received was, as I am informed through the kindness of Professor Bush, a quotation from the Old Testament, written in Hebrew. The execution of this occurred about three o'clock in the afternoon, soon after I had returned from my business. I was alone in my room, when, through the sounds which then occurred in my presence, I was requested to leave the room for the space of five minutes, during which interval they—"spirits"—promised an attempt to write. I obeyed their request, and went into a room below, where sat my sister. I told her what had transpired, and at the expiration of five minutes we both ascended to my room. Instead of finding, as we had conjectured we should, some directions written in English, we discovered this Hebrew quotation, the ink on the paper being still unabsorbed, although after experiments proved that the ink of a hand heavier than that in which the Hebrew was written, would, on the same kind of paper, invariably dry in from two to three minutes' time.

That these writings have not been imposed upon me, I know, because I have *seen some of them written*. I have seen them written in the day time as well as in the night; and that I was in no "abnormal

magnetic state," I infer from the fact that my consciousness of the circumstances of outward life remained unimpaired. The ringing of fire-bells, moving of engines, the tolling of the bells at the ferry, the paddling of the boat's wheels, and various other noises common to the city, were no less distinctly heard than at other times.

That these writings were not perpetrated by myself I have many strong proofs. First: I had never seen any specimens of the languages in which most of the manuscripts were written, and even to the present date, I have seen no other specimens of one or two of the languages used. Second: That power which has communicated to us in our circle, through the rappings and lifting of tables, professes to have performed this writing also.

That these rappings and lifting are not the results of an "abnormal magnetic state," I have reason to suppose from the fact that manifestations have been made in our circle in the light, palpable to the various senses of *all* present, which by far surpassed in point of power the capability of any one in the circle. But if this, too, with all the rest, is but a fancy, a dream, then is my whole life but a dream—a very *real* dream—and not altogether poetical in its course.

Had I time and disposition, I might relate facts sufficient to fill a volume in relation to this matter, the majority of which would favor none other than the spiritual theory; but as I am no literary character, I will here leave the matter to the numerous others who are, and whose facts are doubtless as much to the point as my own.

Yours truly,

E. P. FOWLER.

NEW-YORK, Aug., 1852.

In this connection we may introduce from the same paper the following extract from an extended statement of facts relative to these occurrences, bearing the signatures of the respected gentlemen composing the circle, to the truth of which, as far as we are concerned, we can bear decided testimony. We were not a member of the circle, but attended simply on invitation to that effect purporting to come from the spirits themselves.

"During the session on the 19th of January, 1852, the spirits signified their desire to make a communication in Hebrew. Mr. Partridge asked who should call the alphabet, and received the answer, '*the only one present who understands it*—GEORGE BUSH.' Professor Bush thereupon proceeded to repeat the Hebrew alphabet, and a communication in that language was received."

In addition to the above we may remark that we have in our possession an octagon-shaped pitcher, of Liverpool

ware, the outside of which is covered with Arabic and Hebrew words, written according to Mr. Fowler's statement while he was asleep at night. It was filled with water, a bouquet of flowers put into it, and in the evening placed upon the table of his apartment by his sister, and that with no other design than marks a thousand little acts of female taste and courtesy. In the morning the flat compartments of the pitcher were written over crosswise in the characters above mentioned. The legend, however, is not composed of sentences making a coherent sense, but apparently of detached words or combinations of letters, some of them more than once repeated. The Hebrew for God occurs, as also the phrase in the second Psalm, translated—*They have taken counsel together*. There is also our own name—*lbsh, lebush, for Bush*, in the Hebrew character.

Our object in adverting to these facts is, to state some of the grounds on which we are constrained to yield an undoubting credence to the reality and preternatural origin of these singular manifestations. To multitudes of our readers we have no doubt this will be the last solution they would ever think of giving to the facts in question, and their incredulity on this head we have no disposition to disturb. It cannot be expected that they should feel the force of the evidence that weighs with us, neither can they say that they should not have felt it, as we have, under the same circumstances; that is to say, they are not prepared, on good grounds, to declare our conclusions on the subject unwarranted or unsound. They cannot say but that they would have adopted the same conclusion from the same premises.

But we go the extent of our concessions when we admit the reality of the phenomena in the sense above defined. In an estimate of the intrinsic character of the communications made, and of the practical bearing of the whole affair, we differ *in toto* from most of those who have devoted themselves to the culture of this form of spiritualism so called. Our reasons for this we purpose to give in what follows.

It may not be at once obvious with what propriety our present heading is retained after the concessions we have already made as to the reality and the spiritual origin of the phenomena in question. *Pseudo-Spiritualism* denotes a spiritualism that is *false*, and it may be asked how this epithet can apply to an order of occurrences admitted to be from a veritable spiritual source? It would doubtless be less easy to show the congruity of the appellation with the facts on any other ground than on that of the New Church. Guided by the light of that church, we learn that true spiritualism does not consist in dealing with spiritual things as contradistinguished from natural or physical, but in the opening of the spiritual degree of the mind, and in a course of life, thought, and affection accordant with its principles and dictates. It is indeed to be admitted that the term spiritual not unfrequently occurs in the former sense, especially when used interchangeably with *substantial* as distinguished from *material*. In this sense a man after death is not a natural, but a spiritual man, though still perfectly organized, and having a marked resemblance to the natural man of the flesh. But with men in the natural world translated spirits have no open or sensible communication. They see no longer those of the natural, but those of the spiritual world, and "the reason," says our illumined author, "why they now see the latter, and not the former, is because they are no longer natural men, but *spiritual* or *substantial*; and a spiritual or *substantial* man sees a spiritual or substantial man, as a natural or material man sees a natural or material man, but not *vice versa*, on account of the difference between what is substantial and what is material."—*C. L.* 31. In another connexion he makes the following distinction: "The reason why such representatives exist in the spiritual world, is because in that world there are spiritual things *interior* and *exterior*: *interior* spiritual things are those that relate to affection, and to thought thence derived, or to the intelligence of truth and the wisdom of good; and *exterior* spiritual things are so created by the Lord, that they may clothe or invest *interior* spiritual things, and when these are clothed or invested,

then there exists such forms as are in the natural world, in which, therefore, *interior* spiritual things ultimately terminate, and in which they ultimately exist.”—*A. E.* 582. Here it is clear that the term *spiritual* is applied to denote the substances existing in the spiritual world, in and through which, as representatives and correspondences, interior spiritual principles of thought and affection manifest themselves. This exterior spirituality is of course of a much lower grade than the interior with which it is contrasted.

Now it is in the latter sense—the sense of interior—that the term is dominantly used in the writings of our author; and as our aim is to present a New Church estimate of the general subject, we shall not scruple to quote freely whatever may subserve that end. Nothing is more obvious than that the devotees of these manifestations claim to be spiritualists *par excellence* and our purpose is to submit these claims to the test. We shall perhaps find reason in the end to doubt whether those pretensions have any adequate ground to rest upon; which is but saying, in other words, that the application of the term *pseudo, false*, in this connection, will fully justify itself in the result. The following paragraphs will be seen to be to the point.

“What the spiritual is in respect to the natural, is further to be told in a few words, because the most of those who are in the Christian world, are ignorant what the spiritual is, insomuch that when they hear the expression, they hesitate, and say with themselves that no one knows what spiritual means. The spiritual with man is, in its essence, the very affection of good and truth for the sake of good and truth, and not for the sake of self; also the affection of what is just and equitable for the sake of what is just and equitable, and not for the sake of self; when man from these feels in himself delight and pleasantness, and still more if he feels satisfaction and blessedness, this with him is spiritual, which does not come from the natural world, but from the spiritual, or from heaven, that is, through heaven from the Lord. This then, is the spiritual which, when it reigns with man, affects, and, as it were, tinges everything which he thinks, which he wills and which he acts, and causes that the things thought, and from the will acted, partake of the spiritual, until they also at length become spiritual with him, when he passes out of the natural world into the spiritual. In a word, the affec-

tion of charity and faith, that is, of good and truth, with the delight and pleasantness and still more the satisfaction and blessedness thence, which are felt interiorly with man, and make him a truly Christian man, is the spiritual. That most people in the Christian world are ignorant what is meant by the spiritual, is because they make faith the essential of the church, and not charity : hence, inasmuch as those few, who are solicitous about faith, think little, if anything, concerning charity, and know little, if anything, what charity is, there is no knowledge, neither is there perception of the affection which is of charity, and he who is not in the affection of charity, cannot in any wise know what is spiritual ; so it is especially at this day, when scarcely any one has charity, because it is the last time of the Church. But it is to be known, that the spiritual in the common [or general] sense, signifies the affection both of good and of truth whence heaven is called the spiritual world, and the internal sense of the Word the spiritual sense ; but specifically what is of the affection of good is called celestial ; and what is of the affection of truth is called spiritual.”—*A. C.* 5639.

“ It may be expedient briefly to explain how the case is with good in which are truths ; he who knows the formation of good from truths, knows the veriest arcana of heaven, for he knows the arcana of the formation of man anew, that is, of the formation of heaven or the Lord’s kingdom with him : all christian good, or spiritual good hath in it the truths of faith, for the quality of that good is from the truths which are of faith ; the good which hath not its quality from the truths of faith, is not christian good, but is natural good, which doth not give eternal life ; the reason is, because natural good hath in it only natural life, which life is not unlike the life of beasts, for they also are in good when they are tame ; but beasts cannot receive spiritual life ; hence it is evident that spiritual life is only acquired by the truths of faith. This life, viz., spiritual life, is first acquired by knowing the truths which are of faith, afterwards by acknowledging them, and at length by believing them ; when they are only known, they are then as it were in the door, when they are acknowledged they are then in the outer court, but when they are believed they are then in the bed-chamber, thus they go from the exteriors towards the interiors successively ; in the interior man is the good, which continually flows in from the Lord, and there conjoins itself with truths, and makes them to be faith, and next to be charity ; this good attracts truths to itself, for it is a desire to them, that by them it may procure to itself a quality, and thereby exist.”—*A. C.* 8772.

“ The man who is principled in spiritual good, is a moral man, and a civil man ; and the man who is not principled in spiritual good is neither a moral nor a civil man, but only appears to be so ; though he appears to be so both to himself and also to others. The reason why a man who is not spiritual, can still think, and thence discourse rationally, like a spiritual man, is, because the understanding of man is capable of being elevated into the light of heaven, which is truth, and of seeing

by that light ; but it is possible for the will of man not to be elevated in like manner into the heat of heaven, which is love, and act under its influence. Hence it is that truth and love do not make a one with man, unless it be spiritual : hence also it is that man can exercise his faculty of speech ; this likewise forms a ground of distinction between man and beast. It is owing to the understanding being capable of elevation to heaven without an elevation of the will at the same time that man has the capacity of being reformed, and of becoming spiritual : but he never is reformed and rendered spiritual until the will is elevated also. By virtue of this faculty, enjoyed by the understanding above that of the will, man is capable of thinking rationally, and thence of discoursing rationally, like one that is spiritual, whatsoever be his nature and quality, even though he be principled in evil : nevertheless, it does not hence follow that he is rational ; and the reason is because the understanding does not lead the will, but the will the understanding, the latter only teaching and pointing out the way : and so long as the will is not, with the understanding, in heaven, the man is not spiritual, and consequently not rational : for when he is left to his own will, or to his own love, then he rejects the rational conclusions of his understanding concerning God, concerning heaven, and concerning eternal life ; and assumes in their place such conclusions as are in agreement with the love of his will, and calls them rational.”—*Doc. of Life*, 14, 15.

“ From these considerations it results, that there does not appertain to man the smallest portion of truth, only so far as he is principled in good ; consequently not the smallest portion of faith, only so far as it is conjoined with life. There may be such a thing as thought, respecting the truth of some particular proposition, in the understanding ; but there cannot be acknowledgment amounting to faith, unless there be consent in the will. Thus do faith and life go hand in hand. Hence, then, it is evident, that so far as any one shuns evils as sins, so far he has faith, and is spiritual.”—*Ib.* 52.

From all this we can hardly fail to perceive what is implied by one's being a truly spiritual man. He is one who is imbued with genuine truths, and those truths he is continually intent upon reducing to life, which is in effect converting them into good. The simple belief that there is a spiritual world, the abode of spirits disembodied of clay, and that they are enabled, through physical agencies to communicate with the inhabitants of earth, does by no means necessarily constitute a genuine spirituality in any one. So far from this, it is rather a peculiar phasis of naturalism, for the mere knowledge of spiritual existence, however profound its arcana, does not of itself as-

cend higher than the natural degree. Nor do we feel disposed to qualify this language in view of the fact that many of this school take a decided stand against the materialism and sensualism of the age, contrasting it with the more elevated and sublimated tone of their own sentiments. For in all this there may still be no more than the workings of the natural man.

Undoubtedly a charge of some seriousness is involved in this position, and it is incumbent upon us to make it good by a direct appeal to the uttered oracles which pass current in the school of the *soi disant* spiritualists of the present day. From a tolerably familiar acquaintance with the issues of the press referring themselves to this origin, we are satisfied that, as a general fact, they are utterly wide of the truth on a variety of points which the Newchurchman is taught to regard as all important among the elements which go to constitute a genuine spirituality. It will, we trust, be distinctly understood that in uttering ourselves on the subject under consideration our standpoint is that of the Church of the New Jerusalem. We take for granted the entire truth of its revelations, and cherish not the least scruple in making them the standard by which everything of a professedly spiritual nature is to be tried. We foresee of course, that this will be charged as a gratuitous assumption—that the demand will be superciliously made, what grounds we have for yielding such implicit deference to the authority of Swedenborg—that palpable insinuations of bigotry and sectarianism will be thrown out—but all this moves us not. We are not penning a controversial article. We are not urging the claims of a rival revelation. We are not seeking to make converts of those whose delusions we are aiming to expose. We know too well the strength of that self-derived intelligence which fortifies them against doubt, to suppose that our position will gain the slightest respect in their minds. In fact we do not write for them. We do not expect them to read our strictures, and therefore pay no attention to their foreseen objections. We write for those who sympathise with us in a perfect



assurance of the solidity of the ground on which we stand—who know, on this head, what no others can know who have not shared their investigations. We would fain present to them, if possible, the data on which an adequate judgment is to be formed of a remarkable class of facts and a deplorable train of consequences which are widely passing under their eyes. Our researches may have put documents and deductions in our way which have never occurred to them, and which they would still value. It is their behoof that we consult in the discussion. We would furnish them with materials for forming an enlightened judgment themselves, and at the same time enable them to withstand the tendency of the times to mix up these strange phenomena with the teachings and tidings of the New Dispensation, as if every species of spiritual or psychical abnormalism were to find a home in its bosom. Let this, then, be our apology, or rather our reason, for the positive tone which speaks out in the whole drift of our remarks. We are addressing those who do not require that we should be perpetually laying down or laying open the foundations of our faith.

1. At the head of all the falsities which emanate from this source, is the denial of our Lord's true and essential divinity. With scarcely an exception that has come to our knowledge, the genuine doctrine of the incarnation is denied or ignored, and Christ is represented as merely a noble specimen of humanity, the *deliciæ generis humani*, the appointed medium through whom some impressive ideas of the divine perfections might be most effectually conveyed. The view, at the highest, is simply humanitarian. An exalted and model manhood is the *ne plus ultra* of its ascription to Him whom the Christian is taught to recognize as the veritable Jehovah tabernacling for a season in human flesh, and then dissolving again, so to speak, into the essential Godhead, so that he now exists solely in his Divine Human nature, no longer separated from the Father. How vast the contrast between this and the Christology of the so-styled spiritualists will be evident from the following extracts from their publi-

cations. It will be borne in mind, we trust, that we are giving the *ipsissima verba* of the spirits through their chosen mediums.

"It was this profound interest and intense excitement among the people which gave birth to the idea that Christ was a super-human and divine personage, and which originally produced the present prevailing opinion that he was, in a strict and literal sense, the Son of God. Spirits perceive the true relation which this remarkable individual sustained to the human race, and they see that he was in every sense a MAN—a man more perfect, more harmoniously constituted, and more richly endowed than others, but still a human being. They perceive the mission which this person was selected to perform on earth, and they see that he was chosen and employed as a great medium for the illustration of spiritual power and the transmission of spiritual truth. They perceive, also, the true agency by which the miraculous works, which astonished the people, were performed, and they see that in every instance of superhuman power—in every work which the people could not reconcile with established laws, there dwelt the superintending and ever active energy of the angel-world. Thus were all the miracles which Christ performed during his residence in the body to be attributed to the direct and special influence, not of God, but of spiritual beings who lingered ever near to minister through him to the spiritual wants of man; and in the whole life and ministry of this individual, may the children of men read the evidences of heavenly power and the interposition of angelic spirits, which have been already, and will be in a still higher degree, manifested to the present age."—*Spirit Messenger*, p. 94.

"Jesus Christ came into the world to be a savior of sinners. He was not God manifested in the flesh, neither was he the son of God in a literal sense, but by adoption and grace; and in that sense he was indeed the beloved Son of God. But the question may arise in your mind, how can he be a savior of sinners if you look on him in that light? We will try to explain in a few words to you what the meaning of savior is. St. James in his epistle says, that he that converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins. And can you call that man any thing else but a savior, who is willing to give up every comfort and become a gazing stock, and meet the scorn and reproach, and the contempt and sneers of a gainsaying world, and who is willing even to be persecuted to death if he can only persuade sinners to forsake their evil ways and turn to God. We would refer you to the history of by-gone ages. Do you not read in the Bible that God raised up saviors and sent them among the Jews? And in every age of the world has not God raised up men whose only object was to save souls? And is not he who devotes his time, his talents, and his all to the salvation of his fellow

man, a savior? Was not Noah, the preacher of righteousness, a savior? Did he not try, year after year, with tears and entreaties, to persuade his fellow-men to turn to God? And many are now high in glory whom he was instrumental of saving. And did not Jonah prove himself to be a savior to Nineveh, when the city of Nineveh was devoted to destruction, unless they listened to the warning voice of the prophet."—*Creation of the World and Life of Christ, dictated by the Spirit of Wilbraham*, p. 40.

"At the appointed time Christ was born; but he was not begotten by the Holy Ghost, neither did the power of the Highest overshadow her, only as it overshadows all who walk before him with a perfect heart. He was the natural son of Joseph and Mary. The account that is given of the conception of Christ in the New Testament is blasphemous; and then to teach men that it is the word of God is a sin of no small magnitude. Is it a small matter to throw such insults on the God of spotless purity? Is it nothing to throw such insults on the glorious character of the beneficent Creator of mankind? As spirits who seek your good, we beseech you to grope in darkness no longer, but open your eyes to the truth. It would be no interest to glorified spirits to deceive you. If you could see with what willingness they leave their bright abodes of unutterable glory, and descend to earth amidst its filth and corruption, in order that its inhabitants may be delivered from the cruel bondage of error and superstition, and in order that the glorious character of God may be rightly understood, you would at once banish all your fears."—*Id.* p. 45.

"You need not persuade yourself that Christ possessed something that it is impossible for you to possess, for if you do you are mistaken; for Christ was nothing more than a man. If your life was in accordance with the doctrines he taught, you might enjoy the same blessings. If you denied yourself in the same manner that he did, and fasted, and prayed, and mourned, and wept, and exerted yourself as he did. In short, if you possessed the heartfelt piety and disinterested benevolence that he possessed, you might work miracles the same as he did, for God is the same in all ages of the world. Christ was enabled to work his miracles through the power of the spirit of his heavenly Father. It was not because he was God manifest in the flesh, or because he was begotten by the Holy Ghost. No, it was because he led a life of spotless purity from the cradle to the grave. He was spotless, innocent, and pure, and free from every stain."—*Id.* p. 67.

These extracts are mostly from a work which bears on its title that it is "to be read as for eternity," but what special claim it has to this solemn style of reading may be inferred from the fact, that it is said to be composed

“by the spirits of *Swedenborg*, Wilbraham, Stuart, and Lovell.” We are well aware that multitudes of those who think highly of the “manifestations” would by no means subscribe to the bald blasphemies which stand forth on nearly every page of this work, nor do we intend to impute them to all the school, but we are confident we do them no wrong in the assertion that, as a general fact, the tenet of the Lord’s essential divinity is decidedly repudiated in their ranks. Now that the prevalent denial on this head is inconsistent with a genuine spiritualism is evident from what follows:

“The reason why by the name of the Lord in the Word is primarily understood the acknowledgment of the Divine in his Human Principle, is, because all things of love and faith are thence derived; for the divine goods which are of love, and the divine truths which are of faith, proceed from no other source than from the Lord alone; and those things cannot flow into man, unless he thinks of the Divine Principle of the Lord at the same time that he thinks of his Human; nor is his Divine Principle separate from the Human, but is in the Human. I can assert from all my experience concerning the spiritual world, that no one is principled in the goods of love, and the truths of faith, but he who thinks of the Divine Principle of the Lord in union with his Human, *as also that no one is spiritual*, or an angel, but he who had been grounded in that thought and acknowledgment while in the world. Man ought to be conjoined to the Divine Principle in his faith and love, in order that he may be saved, and all conjunction is with the Lord; and to be conjoined only to his Human Principle, and not at the same time to his Divine, is not conjunction, for the Divine Principle saves, but not the human without the Divine.”—*A. E.* 135.

Abundant intimations to the same effect might be cited from the same source, which, although they will be of little weight with those whom they mostly concern, will not fail to be decisive with the man of the church. He cannot begin to conceive of a truly spiritual man who stumbles at this stumbling-stone of the absolute and essential Deityship of the Lord the Saviour.

2. An utterly disparaging estimate, if not a contemptuous rejection of the Divine Word, as communicated in the Sacred Scriptures, is another distinctive mark of the school in question. Taking, for the most part, their cue from Davis, the grand Coryphæus and mystagogue in

the lengthening line of Seers and Mediums, they look upon nature as the only authoritative revelation.\* Upon

\* We give in this connexion an extract from Mr. Arnold, of Poughkeepsie, purporting to come from "God's high and holy spirit, Jesus Christ, formerly of Nazareth," and whom a recent writer in the "Shekinah" dignifies with the denomination of "Joshua the Seer, commonly known as Jesus of Nazareth;" forasmuch as "Joshua" in Hebrew is rendered "Jesus" in Greek, while the aim of the writer, in taking away the peculiarity of the title, is to degrade him to the level of mere ordinary humanity. It will be seen from the extract that a very grave rebuke is read out to poor, Davis and that he is decidedly put upon his penitentials. As the spirit that rules in Davisism is directly at variance with the spirit that rules in Arnoldism, we will not hazard our neutrality by undertaking to act the umpire between them. We may, however, hint a fear that there is too much ground for the spirits' intimation of a backsliding in Davis.

"I called myself John, in the beginning of this chapter, not because that was my name in the body, but because my servant John, acted for me in writing the Book of Revelation, and united with me in explaining now, what then he did not fully understand. Besides, he is a high son of God, being in the Sixth circle, of the Sixth sphere. He is a noble spirit, who delights to serve God, and who did reveal himself to my clairvoyant spirit, Davis, when he was submissive to the directions he received as a clairvoyant, and was content to follow them, without ambition or sordid desires. But his unity with him ceased, when Davis left the control of himself to men of other motives, and it can never be renewed whilst he continues in his present state of rebellion. It is true, that I permit him to write many truths, and that I allow spirits in the first, second, and third spheres to influence, or direct him, but they are not allowed to declare, even all they know of me, to him; because he rebels against my authority, and seeks to elevate wisdom above love, and will above action. The only way for him to become a truthful medium, is to return to the subjection he was first in to the Divine John; and he can only do that by returning to the state from which he departed when he left my servant, Livingston's, management. Because, in that management, he was kept in subjection to the interior, and holy directions he received in his clairvoyant and unconscious state. Whereas, since, he has been used in the will of those around him, until he was permitted to use himself in his own will. His impressions have been overruled to be a benefit, and a foundation for belief to many. They have been so guided as to be the means of releasing many from bondage to tradition, and from worship of idols of flesh; which men have delighted to worship, ever since the foundation of the error, or heresy, which was laid in the apostolic times, referred to in my relation through John the Divine. This will surprise many who have almost begun to worship Davis, and others, who have honored him as a guide. Many spiritual believers, too, will say, how can it be that he is wrong, when so many spirits have by outward declarations, through rappings, and writings, asserted that his works were in the main, true; and, that believers or inquirers should read them. This was because the works of Davis lead the mind to repose on itself, and

this string the faithful are perpetually harping. The all-sufficiency of the light of nature to meet the religious yearnings and aspirations of the soul is a point of most confident assertion, and whatever is deficient here is made up in the direct communications from the supernal spheres, which, as emanating from the fountain-head of truth, are of course entitled to serve a *supersedeas* upon the old worn-out and by-gone teachings of Moses and the Prophets, of Christ and the Apostles. The ordinary style of descanting upon this subject may be seen from the following specimen :

“ For long ages in the past, mankind have received the Bible with the most profound and solemn reverence. They have looked upon it as a book which is intrinsically holy, every word and sentence of which are the result of a direct influx from the Divine Mind, and therefore authoritative in the most literal and unlimited sense. So far has this reverence for the Bible extended, that individuals whose reason and judgment were not sufficiently blinded to receive all its teachings, have been denominated infidels and heretics, and have been treated as the vilest sinners, by those whose faith in the writings of this book has rendered them professedly holy. The Bible has thus been made the standard, immoveable and fixed, for all thought and action, with reference to subjects of morals or religion. This has been regarded as *the* book which God has given to the world as an expression of his will, and as a revelation of the destiny which he has designed for his creatures. In this, it has been supposed, is contained the records of truth which are unmarred and unsullied by any admixture of earthly error, and have their original source in the great vortex of life and love, which exists in the inconceivable depths of space. According to the profound, but bigoted emotions of the religionists in reference to this book, the minister of the temple has made this a basis for the delivery of lengthy sermons and tedious prayers ; and in correspondence with the

---

disencumber it of prejudice, and leave it in a fit state to receive further revelation. It is a great step gained, when the mind, in the body, is prepared to receive with favor, higher and further revelation. This is the proper effect of Davis' book ; and I can assure all that no believer in the Bible, as founded on revelation, has ever been led out of that belief, by anything that Davis has written ; no believer in the efficacy of prayer has ever ceased to believe in it, or refrained from it, because he has declared it cannot move or affect the Deity.”—*History of the Origin of All Things*, p. 63.

We suspect the spirit has rather too charitable an opinion of the work in question on this latter score. At any rate, if it has not produced the effect asserted, it is owing to no lack of tendency in his volume to do it.

commands which are enjoined, the people attend to the external forms of worship, communion, and baptism, as the means of saving their souls from hell. The superstitions which belong to the past have thus been brought into the sphere of the present age, and the mass are willing to be bound and crushed by those burdening chains which have been placed upon the minds and hearts of all past generations."—*Ambler's Spiritual Teacher*, p. 39.

"As a consequence of this view of the subject which has been gradually fastened upon the human mind, the Bible has been set up as an authority; it has been appealed to as a true and reliable standard of thought on all subjects which pertain to the interests of man—and has been leaned upon as an infallible statement of truth which requires the most implicit and unreasoning confidence, in view of the most terrible penalty which is attached to a want of faith in its divine origin."—*Id.* p. 41.

"The reverence for the Bible which has been the ruling sentiment of human hearts—which has cramped and restricted all the free and noble faculties of the soul, has had its sway upon the earth for ages past, and it is now time that this should be removed for the introduction of a principle which is more worthy of the dignity of man, and more consonant with the design of God. It has been seen by the inhabitants of the Spirit-world, that the authority of the Bible has been the chief and prominent source of all bigotry and superstition; it has been seen that this has been the prolific fountain of all the sects and creeds which have cast their darkening shadow upon the face of humanity; it has been seen that this is the primary cause of all the narrow-mindedness, all the contraction of thought, and all the blind devotion to human systems of faith, which have been, and are still, conspicuous features of the world's history."—*Id.* p. 42.

"What has been the real effect of the authority with which this book has been endowed? The spirits have seen this influence and this effect, and they will answer the inquiry which they have made. They have seen that, through the devotion which has been paid to the supposed word of God, the reason of man has been left unexercised and unexpanded: they have seen that, from this cause, all the most exalted powers of the soul have remained weak and unimproved; and they have seen that in consequence of a rigid adherence to the standard presented in the popular oracles of faith, the soul has been restricted to the narrow limits of creeds which bear no assimilation with the all-expanding truths of the Universe, and no relation to the bright realities of Heaven. Thus the influence and effect which have flowed from the authority of the Bible have been of the most deleterious character, tending to degrade rather than to elevate, to confine rather than to expand, and to crush and destroy rather than to ennoble and save."—*Id.* pp. 43, 44.

Having by this summary process put an extinguisher on the Bible as a veritable and authoritative revelation from God, the "spirits" proceed, in the plenitude of their condescension, to point, as with index-finger, to that truer, purer, more reliable revelation which forms the theme of so much eulogy and glorification on the part of their earthly disciples.

"But there is a revelation of the Divine Mind--there is a word of God, which is superior to all that finite minds can impart or conceive; and this is a revelation which must be regarded with the reverence which is true and just; it is a revelation which will call forth the inherent energies of the soul in the direction of its Divine Author. The revelation to which the spirits here refer, is the Creation which has been introduced into being through the action of the Supreme Intelligence;--it is the Universe which is the natural and untranslated expression of the Infinite Mind. No rational individual can doubt that this is the real and infallible production of the Deity; and no mind which will exercise the powers of which it is possessed, can be disposed to deny that the scriptures of earth and heaven are the only true and direct revelation which has ever been given to his intelligent children."--*Id.* p. 51.

The apotheosis of nature is here complete. The Universe and its Author are made to change places, and the Bible goes into abeyance forever. Its pages may answer for lining trunks and bandboxes, but as a vehicle of heavenly truth they are of no further account.

How remote is this from the estimate which the man of the New Church is taught to form of the written Word will be apparent from the following paragraphs:

"The Lord is present and in conjunction with man through the Word, seeing that the Lord is the Word, and, as it were, converses in it with man, because the Lord is Divine Truth itself, and the Word is Divine Truth also. From hence it plainly appears that the Lord is present with man, and in conjunction with him, according to his understanding of the Word: for according to it, man has truth, and from thence faith, and also love, and thence life."--*D. C. S. S.* 78.

"All science and doctrine of good and truth is derived from the Word. The natural man may indeed know, and also perceive, what is good and true, but only natural and civil good and truth; he cannot know what spiritual good and truth is, for the knowledge of this can only come from revelation, or from the Word."--*A. C.* 3768.



“ Without the Word no one would have any knowledge of God, or of Heaven, or Hell, or of a life after death, and much less of the Lord. But there are persons who insist, and confirm themselves in the opinion that man, without the Word, might know the existence of a God, and likewise of heaven and hell, with other points which the Word teaches, and who by that means, derogate from the authority and holiness of the Word, if not with their mouth, yet in their heart; and it would not be proper to reason with such persons from the Word, but from the natural light of reason, for they do not believe the Word but themselves.”

He then institutes a course of powerful argument founded upon the dictates of natural reason, going to show the absolute necessity of a written revelation to impart any just knowledge of spiritual and divine things. See the Treatise entitled “ *The Doctrine of the N. J. concerning the Sacred Scriptures*,” 115. In the same vein are the following passages from other portions of the writings.

“ By not cursing God is signified not to blaspheme Truth Divine, and by not execrating the prince is signified not to blaspheme the doctrine of truth. Truth Divine is the Word, and the doctrine of the Church is truth thence derived. It is allowed briefly to say how the case is with the blasphamation of Truth Divine. Truth Divine is the Word and is doctrine derived from the Word; they who deny these things in heart, blaspheme, although with the mouth they praise the Word and preach it. In the denial lies concealed the blasphemy, which also bursts forth when they are left to themselves and think, especially in the other life, for their hearts speak, things external being removed. They who blaspheme or deny the Word, are incapable of receiving anything of the truth and good of faith, for the Word teaches that the Lord is, that heaven and hell are, that there is a life after death, that faith and charity are, and several other things, which without the Word or revelation would not be at all known; wherefore they who deny the Word, are incapable of receiving anything which the Word teaches, for when they read it or hear it, a negative principle occurs, which either extinguishes truth, or turns it into what is false. Wherefore with the man of the Church the first of all principles is to believe the Word, and this is the primary principle with him who is in the truth of faith and the good of charity; but with those who are in the evils of self-love and the love of the world, the primary principle is not to believe the Word, for they reject it instantly when they think about it, and they also blaspheme it. If a man saw how great blasphemies against the Word appertain to those who are in the evils of the above loves, and what is the quality of

those blasphemies, he would be struck with horror : the man himself, during his abode in the world, does not know it, because they lie concealed behind the ideas of the active thought, which passes off into speech with men ; nevertheless they are revealed in the other life, and appear dreadful."—*A. C.* 9222.

So in the exposition of the Apocalypse where it is said of the New Jerusalem that it had no need of the light of the sun or the moon, but that the glory of God doth lighten it, it is said that,

"This signifies that the men of that church will not be principled in self-love and self-derived intelligence, and thence in natural light alone, but in spiritual light, by virtue of the Divine Truth of the Word derived from the Lord alone."—*A. R.* 919.

By the glory of God is signified the Word in its divine light. By its light is signified the Divine Truth therein, for this is meant by light in the Word."—*A. R.* 897.

This, then, is the light by which the men of the New Church are to walk, and they at least may be expected to rate at its true value that deceitful and sophistical *lumen*,

"Which leads to bewilder, and dazzles to blind."

Assuredly no one can adopt those specious rationalistic fallacies, of which we have given such striking specimens above, without turning his back upon the splendor of the Celestial City, and plunging himself into the darkness, mists, and mazes of a philosophy as remote from truth as is hell from heaven. Indeed, the tendency of this self-vaunting naturalism, in its contemptuous estimate of revelation, is clearly depicted in what is said of the lot of its votaries in the other life.

"There are some who, in the life of the body, had despised the Word, and some who, by a ludicrous application of Scripture phrases in common discourse, had abused it ; some, too, who had imagined the Word to be of no consequence but to keep the vulgar in awe ; some who had blasphemed the Word, and some who had profaned it. The lot of these in the other life is miserable ; of every one according to the quality and degree of his contempt, derision, blasphemy, and profana-

tion. For the Word is esteemed so holy in the heavens, that it is, as it were, heaven to those that dwell there ; wherefore, as in the other life, there is a communion of the thoughts of all, it is not possible for such spirits to be in company with the angels, but they are separated." —A. C. 1878.

This of course will be scouted as idle babbling by all those who pay homage to the more reliable rapping, tipping, and writing communications vouchsafed in modern times to mortals ; but those for whom we are inditing these suggestions will read it with other eyes. "He that hath a dream let him tell a dream ; but he that hath my word, let him declare my word." "What is the chaff to the wheat?"

We had proposed, at the outset, to prosecute the subject before us under a variety of other heads, showing up the falsities of the Spiritual School—the New Philosophy—the Harmonial Brotherhood—or whatever else it may be called—as it respects the Eternity of the Hells, the Doctrine of Progression, and several other items which figure largely in the general system. But we find to our regret that such inroads on our available space have been already made that we must of necessity forego our original plan, as we are unwilling to carry over any series of articles to the next volume, which we would commence with "clean papers." Some few remarks on the general theme will conclude the whole.

Our admission of the truth of the phenomenon, i. e., the truth of its spiritual origin, has been very explicit. We know not how to question the evidence that spirits do in fact communicate sensibly with men, nor would we detract aught from the magnitude of the marvel. Indeed, we esteem it as *par excellence* the most astounding event of the present era. We regard it as altogether worthy the attention and investigation of every intelligent mind, provided such minds shall not prefer, as no doubt many in the New Church will, to take the main facts upon testimony, and not trouble themselves with a scrutiny which can add little or nothing to their present convictions. While the laws of psychology prepare them

to admit substantially the great averments on this head, the laws of order, as they apprehend them, put a veto upon *their* being enrolled even into a committee of inquiry relative to the fact, or the mode of the manifestations. With this estimate of the matter, we are strongly inclined to side, notwithstanding we have embraced every convenient opportunity to investigate thoroughly the phenomena for ourselves. We have, through the courtesy of friends, witnessed it under the most auspicious circumstances, and in its most favorable phases. Many of the communications to which we have listened have been of a very interesting character, and none have given token of being prompted by a decidedly evil or malign class of spirits. On the contrary, their enunciations have for the most part savored of kindness, benevolence, *bienfeasance*, and, as far as we could judge, truth. But then we have never allowed ourselves to interrogate them relative to religious doctrines. We could not bring ourselves to do in act what would imply that we admitted for a moment the existence of any higher standard of truth than we had always recourse to in the revelations of the Word and of the New Church. Whatever their response on this head, it would have no appreciable effect upon our prior convictions. If it agreed with them, it would not strengthen our assurance; if it conflicted with them, it would not weaken it. What motive, then, could we have for consulting such an oracle on such a subject? "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, there is no light in them."

And here it is that we put our finger upon the peccant point of the whole system of pseudo-spiritualism. The devotees of the Rappings, as a general fact, have no experience of such scruples as we have now alluded to. When these ultra-mundane responses rush in like a flood, there seems to be no Spirit of the Lord to lift up a standard against them. They are received, for the most part, as valid oracles—as the voice of truth from its inner sanctuary—and the result is that they are suffered to

supersede every other form of revelation, and carry away the faith captive to their most anti-christian dicta. It is this effect that we are more especially prompted to deplore in connection with the "manifestations." It is not that the "spirits" discourse nothing but falsities, for they do doubtless say many isolated good and true things; but it is the fearful ascendancy which they are allowed to gain over the minds of their votaries, and which goes so far to neutralize all the better results that might otherwise follow from a marvel so astounding to the natural and the worldly mind as the fact of intercourse being actually opened between the visible and the invisible spheres. It is mournful to think of simple and well-disposed souls being so grievously deluded by the claim to a pure and elevated spiritualism, when in fact the very first rudiments of such a spiritualism are wanting. Look over the multitudinous array of "peeping" and "muttering" pamphlets, professing to be laden with the burdens of the supernal spheres, and where do you find, amidst all their canting exhortations to "harmony," and a certain species of *goodishness*, the utterance of one single remark that goes to lay open the intrinsic nature of good, to show its distinction from, and yet its relation to, truth, or one gleam of light thrown upon the process of regeneration? For ourselves we have sought it in vain, as also in vain a circle where this was felt to be any particular desideratum. Instead of the vigorous and life-stirring dogmas of the New Dispensation which instruct men precisely in what they need, and how and where to obtain it, we are treated from this source with page after page *ad nauseam* of the most puling and maudlin sentimentalism, of which the following are fair specimens.

"*From the Spirit of a Mother to her Son.*—MY DEAR SON,—If you want to progress you must let your mind dwell upon the beauties of nature, and of the spirit home. The contemplation of the works of the Almighty fills the mind with high and lofty thoughts, well suited to an immortal being of his creation. The spirit home is full of happiness; all are happy. None of God's creatures are doomed to be miserable, but to enjoy all the happiness they are capable of doing. This is especially the case with man. While he is on the earth he has to endure some

trouble and pain, but this is only for a short season, and during that time it is intermingled with a much greater proportion of happiness. After the mortal body is cast off, all misery and pain are cast off too. After this transition takes place, the spirit is introduced into a delightful home, surrounded by sweet and soothing influences, and is drawn up into communion with those that are more developed, and consequently higher in the spirit-home than they. It is thus taught and developed by the most pleasant means, and progresses from circle to circle. All progress—none remain where they enter—all have the same chance there. There are no drawbacks, no temptations to lure them from the right path—progression is sure and easy. Now let your mind dwell on these truths, and expand our influence, and you will enjoy much more pure happiness than you have ever yet enjoyed.”—*Hist. of Rec. Develop. in Philadelphia*, p. 64.

“*To a Gentleman from his Brother.*—MY DEAR BROTHER,—Your mind was so favorably inclined when you came in that you had not much difficulty in believing that you were surrounded by dear and beloved friends, who were anxious to communicate with you, and unfold to you new truths. Did mankind only know the beauty and harmony of the spirit home, they would not allow their minds to dwell so much on the things of the earth, but lift them up in holy contemplation of that lovely place. You cannot conceive of its beauties, much less of the infinite and lovely character of its Divine Creator. Man has debased him, and brought him lower than himself, by giving attributes to an infinite degree that should not be possessed in a finite degree. Let not your mind look upon him in this light, but in a far higher and more glorious one. You can form no idea of our happiness; words cannot express it. This glorious destiny is prepared for all men without exception; none are to be excluded, all shall be happy. Those who do not develop themselves while on earth, must see that they have not treasured their time as they should have done before. They must enter a lower circle than they need otherwise have done, and be properly taught and developed by those more advanced. Now will you not pay attention to these words, and prepare yourself for an abode in the higher circle immediately upon leaving the earth. Done.”—*Id.* p. 65.

“*From the Spirit of a Sister in answer to the question, ‘Is she dead?’*—No, I am not dead, but live in a more glorious life. O! we are all happy in the spirit home. My dear sister, I am happy to have an opportunity to communicate with you. I have long wished to manifest myself to you, but your condition has not been such as to permit such sweet communion with you. Your idea of the spirit after it leaves its tenement of clay is wrong; such is the fact with most people. Mortals, with their unassisted mental perceptions, cannot understand about the existence of the spirit after it bursts its prison door and soars away in immortal life. Did you understand the laws of progression that govern the development of the immortal spirit, you would live, while

on earth, so as to develop all the higher and holier attributes of the mind. Our mission is to teach mankind this, among other important lessons, concerning their life in a physical and spiritual existence. Man lives for a high and noble purpose. He was created in the image of God—his spirit is an emanation from God. God is with man: though he tramples all that is good beneath him for a time, yet the good within him at times will triumph over his carnal nature. None are so far lost in wrong doing but they will be developed in a slow degree, if but little in life, the more to be developed in the spirit home. Your cold selfish forms, your cold sectarianism, hinders your progress in spiritual development, and is the cause of much wrongdoing among men. God is love—love one another, cultivate harmonious relations among you, and you will reap a rich reward in the peace and happiness that will increase among you. Dear sister, think of what I communicate to you, and do not reject it because it is new to you. It is in accordance with the laws which God in his wisdom has established for the more rapid progress of the human family towards a higher spiritual condition. Done.”—*Id.* p. 66.

Whole volumes of such sickly stuff as this have doubtless been indited within the last three years, and the same staple bids fair, from present omens, to be stretched out to the “crack of doom.” If any one would see it in its perfection, let him consult the “Spiritual Messenger” of R. P. Ambler, whose pages are a model on the score of diluted inanity. *Ecce signum.*

“Love is the chosen and effectual purifier of man;—it is that which reaches down to the deep source of action, and clears the fountain from which the streams go forth. In vain has the Church hurled its anathemas upon the sinner; in vain has it robed the destiny of man in a veil of blackness, and made wild terror the instrument of repentance; for with all the thunders of almighty ire, with all the picturings of dark despair, the saint and sinner sleep alike, and smile in mockery at the tragic scene. The world now needs a more gentle ministry. It needs to be warmed and subdued by that attractive influence which shines in the sun and lights the stars. It needs to feel in its heart the power of that celestial love, which is the angel of the Supreme Divinity. Think not that such a principle as this is weak—that it cannot reach to the sinful, the degraded, and the lost. It is in this world of sin that Love has its work to do. Far away over the wastes of human life—down among the hiding-places of the guilty—far down where the tear of human sympathy is seldom shed, shall its blessed power extend; and wherever the fallen victims of crime may dwell—wherever the struggling soul may strive with the tempter—wherever the chains of habit have bound and burdened the heart—wherever sin, and guilt, and wretchedness exist—where tears have flowed and sighs are breathed,

there shall it perform its mission. Yes; it shall go forth where no other power can reach, gaining its silent victories in a sanctuary where sword and flame may never enter. Lo! the accents of love are breathed, and the poor wanderer, whose heart has been long chilled with indifference, turns and smiles; those accents come again to the tempted, and even while raising the cup of death to his lips, the trembling hand is stayed, and a noble purpose is born within his heart; and then, once more, that voice of love falls upon the ear of the criminal—it speaks to him who has heard before but the sound of scorn—to him who has been deserted, despised, and hardened in his sin; and behold! there, in those clanking chains, and amid the dungeon's gloom, that strong heart is melted, and he weeps. Oh! sweet angel of Love! thou art the chosen minister of Heaven—thy breathing tones find their echo in the inmost heart, where the image of God can never be effaced.”—*Spirit Messenger*, p. 155.

If it were not profane to suppose that among the numerous upper and nether “spheres” of which these rapping “revealments” (vocalism most uncouth!) speak, there were a Boarding School Misses’ sphere, we should have no farther to seek for the source of the inspiration of scores of paragraphs like the above.

On the whole, it can hardly fail, we think, to be apparent to a Newchurchman that we have in these unique and marvellous manifestations an order of phenomena with which he can cherish but precious little sympathy, except by proving recreant to principles which, as a Newchurchman, he cannot but regard as immovable as the pillars of the universe. He may, if he pleases, investigate the facts as he would any other class of scientifics, in order to pronounce a more intelligent judgment upon the subject, should his opinion be demanded. To this he will often find himself exhorted. “Investigate—open the mind to evidence—be loyal to truth.” Well, and suppose he *has* investigated, and that his mind is fully made up—suppose that he admits freely the supernatural character of the marvel. What then? What more has he to do with it? What uses can it subserve to him? He may never himself have received or witnessed a false communication; but judging the tree by its fruits, what conclusion can he reach but that, be the spirits good or bad, the emanations which come forth from them are not,



as a general fact, entitled to credit. In the department of natural things he cannot repose confidence in their statements any farther than as they are confirmed by other evidence drawn from other sources. In the region of spiritual matters, what light can they afford him of any value which he has not already? Would he set their credibility above that of the illuminated seer of the New Church? When he finds, for instance, these ghostly revelators saying from the other world, as they usually do, that they saw their lifeless bodies reposing on their beds, surrounded by weeping friends, and that, too, in a few moments after their dissolution, how much will this weigh against the positive declaration of Swedenborg, that the spiritual can take no direct and immediate cognizance of the material, any more than the material does of the spiritual—that there must be some intervening medium, psychologically adapted, through whose eyes the objects of earth can be seen? What, moreover, can he think of the reliability of communications which so generally—we do not say universally—lead the “circles” to deny the supreme divinity of Jesus, to reject the Bible-Word as the grand authoritative embodiment of Divine Truth, to scout the eternity, not to say, in many cases, the existence of the hells, to ignore the necessity of regeneration, and to inculcate a system of ethics which makes little or no account of the relations of genuine charity to genuine truth? That these are actually the characteristics of the spiritualism—if we may use the misnomer—which we are now subjecting to review—that its whole literature is leavened with them—it is impossible to deny. That exceptional cases occur we are free to admit; but that we have not libelled the system and the “circles” we have the strongest assurance. And now what were whole ship-loads of such trash compared with the one single paragraph from the luminous pen of Swedenborg which we here insert?

*“In what degree a mediate revelation, which is effected by means of the Word, is preferable to an immediate revelation, which is effected by means of spirits.—It is generally believed that man might be more enlightened,*

and become more wise, if an immediate revelation was granted him by means of converse with spirits and angels ; but the reverse is the case. Illustration by means of the Word is effected by an interior way, whereas, illustration by means of an immediate revelation, is effected by an exterior way. The interior way is by the will into the understanding, the exterior way is by the hearing into the understanding. Man, by means of the Word, is illustrated by the Lord, in proportion as his will is in good ; but man by hearing may be instructed, and, as it were, illustrated, although his will is in evil, and what enters into the understanding in a man, whose will is in evil, is not within the man but without him, and is only in his memory and not in his life, and what is without man and not in his life, is gradually separated, if not before, nevertheless after death ; for the will, which is in evil, either casts it out or suffocates it, or falsifies and profanes it ; for the will constitutes the life of man, and continually acts upon the understanding, and regards as extraneous what is derived into the understanding from the memory. On the contrary, the understanding does not act on the will, but it only teaches in what manner the will should act : wherefore if a man knew from heaven whatever is known to the angels, or if he knew whatever is contained in the Word, and moreover all that is contained in the doctrines of the church, which the fathers have written and councils declared, and his will remains in evil, nevertheless, after death, such a man would be regarded as one who knows nothing, because he does not will what he knows ; and whereas evil hates truth in this case, the man himself casts out truths, and in the room thereof adopts such falses as are in agreement with the evil of his will. Moreover permission is not granted to any spirit nor to any angel to teach any man on this earth in divine truths, but the Lord himself teaches every one by means of the Word, and the man is taught in proportion as he receives good from the Lord in his will, and he receives good in the same proportion as he flees evils as sins ; every man also is in a society of spirits as to his affections, and as to his thoughts thence derived, in which society his mind is, as it were, present with them : wherefore spirits speaking with man, speak from his affections, and according to them.

“A man cannot converse with other spirits unless the societies in which he is be first removed, which cannot be done except by a reformation of his will ; because every man is in society with spirits who are in the same religion with himself, wherefore, when the spirits converse with him, they confirm whatever a man has made a part of his religion ; consequently, enthusiastic spirits confirm whatever is of enthusiasm with man ; Quaker spirits confirm whatever is of Quakerism ; Moravian spirits whatever is of Moravianism, and so forth. Hence proceed confirmations of the false which can never be extirpated. From this it appears, that mediate revelation, which is effected by means of the Word, is preferable to immediate revelation, which is effected by means of spirits. As to what regards myself, it was not allowed to take anything from the dictate of any spirit, or from the dictate of any angel, but from the dictate of the Lord alone.”—*Con. Sac. Scrip. from Experience*, p. 11.

We have now completed our task, and know not that we shall ever have occasion to revert to it. We are well aware that our views on the subject will impinge somewhat gratingly upon the theories and the feelings of several personal friends whom we are truly sorry to offend, if offence does indeed come of it. Our remarks will undoubtedly savor to them of a narrowness of spirit, of a "sectarian bigotry," from which they had hoped us fairly quit. From such we must bespeak all the charity they may have it in their power to bestow. We trust they will perceive that our object is simply to expose what we conscientiously regard as a pernicious system of *pseudo-spiritualism*. We have endeavored to strip it of its specious disguises, and by presenting it in contrast with a spiritualism which is pure and true—which is from the Lord, and leads to the Lord—to persuade the man of the New Church to abjure all fellowship with it, and to fall back upon those surer oracles which were graciously designed as "a lamp to our feet and a guide to our path."

~~~~~

#### THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY *versus* THE FAMILIAR SPIRITS AND THE WIZARDS.

[N. C. Repository, February, 1853.]

"AND WHEN THEY SHALL SAY UNTO YOU, SEEK UNTO THEM THAT HAVE FAMILIAR SPIRITS, AND UNTO WIZARDS THAT PEEP, AND THAT MUTTER : SHOULD NOT A PEOPLE SEEK UNTO THEIR GOD ? FOR THE LIVING TO THE DEAD ?

"TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY : IF THEY SPEAK NOT ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM."—Is. viii. 19, 20.

EVENTS transpiring at this day, and which will readily suggest themselves to the reader, render the juxtaposition of things in these two verses quite remarkable. The bane and the antidote are here presented side by side.

The "Law and the Testimony," or the truth of the Divine Revelation is distinctly made the standard by which every pretended supernatural communication is to be tried. If it be not in accordance with these, it gives evidence at once of being a product of darkness, and not an emanation of light. The word, however, here rendered "light" is peculiar. It is the more appropriate term for *morning*, as it is for the most part translated. In this sense the implication is, that those who have recourse to these forbidden oracles have never yet hailed the morning dawn of the New Dispensation in the afflux of its enlightening beams. The language is plainly that of a pointed rebuke to those who would forego the infallible source of all wisdom and truth for the vain and lying divinations of necromancers and paltering "mediums" between the living and the dead. "For the living to the dead?" That is, shall consultation be had in behalf of the living to the dead? by which we may properly understand that the spiritually living in this life are not to have recourse to the spiritually dead in the other life; from which the inference is not difficult to be drawn, that the spirits who communicate on these occasions have their interiors closed, which is spiritual death. If they were open, they would have something to say about genuine good and genuine truth, and their inter-relations, for these are the *peculium* of the spiritual mind; but we have sought in vain for any distinct recognition of these principles in all the spirit-lore that has come under our observation. Spirits whose interiors are opened could never speak lightly or disparagingly of the Divine Word, the grand repository of Truth, and yet nothing is more evident than the fact of a general—we do not say universal—repudiation of Holy Writ by these rapping, writing, and speaking spirits, and their devotees.

## S L E E P .

[N. C. Repos., Feb. and March, 1855.]

“So he giveth his beloved sleep.”—PSALM cxxvii. 2.

THE first emotions excited by these words of the Psalmist would naturally be those of the Christian, rather than of the philosopher or naturalist. They address themselves with peculiar pertinence and power to that state of mind which gratefully recognizes the divine benefaction in the unchanging ordinance of day and night, and the alternate seasons of activity and repose, which cheer while they checker the scenes of sublunary life. There is something, to a devout frame of spirit in sinking sweetly into sleep and awaking from it vigorous and refreshed, that brings more vividly to mind the divine protection than perhaps anything else that occurs in the round of our daily experience. The state of sleep is one of such utter helplessness and dependence, that if ever we are prompted to lift our souls in thankful acknowledgment of the tutelary care of Providence, it is when we open our eyes in the morning upon the light of returning day, and think of the love which kept unsleeping and protecting vigils over us while buried in unconscious slumbers. Under such impressions, we read a double significance in the language of the Psalmist, “I laid me down and slept; I awaked, for the Lord sustained me.” “I will both lay me down in peace and sleep; for thou, Lord, only makest me to dwell in safety.” And in another place, “The Lord will not suffer thy foot to be moved; he that keepeth thee will not slumber. Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep. The Lord is thy keeper; the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand. The sun shall not

smite thee by day, nor the moon by night. The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil; he shall preserve thy soul."

Such is the view that simple-hearted piety takes of this and similar texts, and we cannot of course deny that the devout emotions awakened are altogether appropriate and conducive to the nourishment of the religious principle. It is always pleasant to witness a state of mind which appreciates *common* blessings—which finds matter for ever-growing admiration and praise in the most familiar objects that minister to our comfort—which, in a word, is ever receiving *new* affections from *old* sources. But the type of piety prevalent in the greater portion of Christendom shrinks from advancing further than this. It fears the damaging of truly spiritual interests by penetrating too deeply into the interior nature and rationale of things. It is fearful of the explorations of science in the field of faith. It would not have one go down with a lighted torch to the foundations of the temple of its Jerusalem, even if it were certain of finding there a mine of gold or diamonds. What, it asks, has scientific or philosophic truth to do with the *sentiment* of the devout soul? Can we look into the arcana of creation without descending somewhat from that hallowed height of feeling which brings us into the closest communion with the Divine? Is there not danger of contracting a certain degree of secularity, or profanity, in our religious frames, by permitting the thoughts to expatiate over the field of science, and to study deeply into the relation of cause and effect?

To all this the man of the New Church has a ready answer. He is prepared at once to affirm, that from the intimate relation between the two grand principles of Love and Wisdom it is impossible that the deepest researches of intellect can be any detriment to the purest emotions of piety. As everything natural refers itself to spiritual causes, we are conducted by physical phenomena to the very region of spirituality, and in this region the actings of the mind must be intelligent, yet who can question that they are devout?

In investigating the nature of Sleep, as a marvellous and mysterious feature of our human economy, we are treading emphatically upon New Church ground ; for our system, as is well known to every receiver, makes much of the animal and mental structure of man, and is moreover ever fain to push physiology into the sphere of psychology, and to connect theology with both wherever it can be done. We shall see as we proceed, that nothing offers a finer field for this than sleep ; and the mode of treatment to be pursued is one that will be sought in vain in the mass of writers on physiology, as they are very sure, for the most part, to be smitten, whenever they approach the borders of the spiritual, with what we may term a kind of *psychophobia*—or shuddering dread of anything that transcends the precincts of the purely natural. Profoundly grateful would we be that the very genius of the New Church is the recognition of all natural truth as the outbirth of spiritual, and the impossibility of rightly viewing them apart from each other. We are passing continually back and forth between two worlds when we are unfolding the philosophy of the New Church.

In attempting to develop the physiology of sleep, it is important to advert to the distinction between the *voluntary* and the *involuntary* functions of our economy, and the two great ruling organs, the cerebrum and the cerebellum, upon which, for the most part, they respectively depend. The former or the voluntary functions, are under what we may term the more especial supervision and control of the cerebrum, or the frontal portion of the brain, and the latter, the involuntary, of the cerebellum, or posterior part of the brain. On this head we are enabled to confirm the inductions of science by the revelations vouchsafed to the great authority of the New Church.

“ Sense in general, or general sense, is distinguished into voluntary and involuntary ; voluntary sense is proper to the cerebrum, but involuntary sense is proper to the cerebellum ; these two general senses are conjoined with man, but still distinct ; the fibres which issue

forth from the cerebrum exhibit in general the voluntary sense, and the fibres which issue from the cerebellum exhibit in general the involuntary sense; the fibres of this double origin conjoin themselves in the two appendixes which are called the *medulla oblongata* and the *medulla spinalis*, and pass through them into the body, and form together its members, viscera, and organs. Those which gird about the body, as the muscles and skin, and also the organs of the senses, receive for the most part fibres from the cerebrum; hence man has sense and hence motion according to his will; but the parts which are within that girding or enclosure, and are called the viscera of the body, receive fibres from the cerebellum; hence man has no sense thereof, neither are those parts under the disposal of the will. From these considerations it may in some degree appear, what sense in general is, or the general voluntary sense, and the general involuntary sense. It is moreover to be observed, that there must needs be a general in order that there may be any particular, and that what is particular can in no wise exist and subsist without what is general; and indeed that it subsists in what is general; and that everything particular is circumstanced according to the quality and according to the state of what is general; this is the case also with sense appertaining to man, and likewise with motion."—A. C. 4325.

The waking state is constituted by the waking condition of the cerebrum and all that depends upon it, as this holds the voluntary principle in a kind of erectness or tension over the whole body. This is done by means of a continual supply of the nervous fluid, of which the brain is doubtless the grand depository and almoner, and so long as this element is supplied, the tension of the muscles and fibres continues. The effect is that the structures generally, especially the brain and the lungs, are maintained in a state of comparative uprightness and rigor, so that the interstices and fissures are kept divided and open, affording a free, unobstructed passage or channel between them. They are preserved in a state opposite to that of relaxation or collapse. During sleep, on the other hand, these interstitial apertures are in a measure closed and almost obliterated by the approximation of their *parietes*, or walls, the two conditions being somewhat fairly represented by a number of sacks, first filled and then empty. The collapse of the cerebrum itself causes a corresponding collapse in the lungs, and the bringing nearer together of the loosened vesicles, or



air-cells, obstructs the free passage of the breath, and thus occasions *stertor*, or snoring. For the same reason, as the foldings of the brain lose their tension and become comparatively flaccid, there is a kind of stupidity or dullness for a short time after one awakes, and it is only after several acts of yawning and stretching that the structures acquire the requisite degree of tenseness, bracing, or rigidity to enable them to act with efficiency under the control of the will. The string must be tightened in order to speed the arrow powerfully and rapidly from the bow. Yawning and stretching seem to aid the process of tension.

We may regard it then as unquestionable that the waking from sleep is the waking of the cerebrum to the active discharge of its controlling or superintendent functions, the sphere of which is the voluntary muscular movements. How it is that the cerebrum is enabled to minister the medium of this increased activity to the nerves and muscles, we shall consider by and by; but I here repeat the remark, that the cerebrum holds the reins of the voluntary system throughout the day, during which it infuses a corresponding wakefulness and animation to every part of the body, thus holding all the organs that are under its control in readiness to execute on the instant its slightest command.

During the night and the season of sleep, this order of things is reversed. The cerebrum is no longer dominant, but yields up the empire of the whole economy to the cerebellum, whose province it is to govern the involuntary motions, as those of the lungs, and the various secreting and assimilating processes which are constantly going on, as well when we sleep as when we wake. "I have been instructed," says Swedenborg, "that the cerebellum is awake during sleep, when the cerebrum is asleep."—*A. C.* 1997. So also in the "*Animal Kingdom*," written before his illumination, he says: "The cerebrum rules in the day time, and excites itself at will to general and particular animations. The cerebellum, on the other hand, takes up the reins at night, and

obliges the cerebrum itself and the two medullæ to follow its own reciprocal acts of animation." There is this remarkable difference in the operation of the two departments. The voluntary motions are subject to fatigue, and need to be recruited and reinforced by fresh supplies of the proper stimulus, while the involuntary appear never to tire, but keep on from infancy to old age, in one ceaseless round of action. Continual exercise exhausts the energies of the voluntary system, and in order that the wearied functions may be again excited, stronger stimulants must be employed, or they must be refreshed by repose. This refreshment is actually afforded by the operation of the cerebellum during sleep; as this organ has for its office to repair the damages, to make up for the wear and tear which the body sustains under the action of the cerebrum during the labors of the previous day.

But the question will naturally be proposed, *how* it is that the cerebellum should be able to continue its functions without exhaustion, and as a living fountain to pour forth the vital influence which goes incessantly to renovate the impaired vigor of the system. This question cannot be answered without having recourse to the central doctrine of influx from the Divine Head-spring of life. That all life is by influx from the Lord into adapted receptacles, is a fundamental tenet of the New Church, and it is so, simply because it is the dictate of all right reason and all divine revelation. This truth, however, is no more certain than that in man are two receptacles of life from the Lord; viz., the will and the understanding, or the love and the intellect. But that the cerebrum is more appropriately the seat of the understanding, and the cerebellum of the will, we are taught by Swedenborg in express terms. "For be it observed," says he, in the treatise on Influx (n. 11,) "that the seat of the understanding is in the cerebrum, or fore part of the head, but that of the will is the cerebellum, or the hinder part." Taking this then as established, the whole tenor of our doctrine concerning influx leads

to the position, that the more immediate flowing-in of the divine love, which is the essential element of life, is into the cerebellum, the seat of affection, rather than into the cerebrum, the seat of thought. On this head we are happy to be able to fortify our position by an authority which is beyond question with the major part of those for whom we write.

“‘And I turned to see the voice that spake with me.’—That thereby is signified the understanding enlightened, may appear in some degree from what was said above, n. 55, in the explication of what is signified by John’s hearing a voice behind him. It is evident that these words contain an arcanum which cannot be known, till it is understood how the divine influx from heaven enters the mind of man, for it was from influx that John heard the voice behind him, and that afterwards, being turned to see the voice, he saw the things which followed. The divine influx from heaven is into the will of man, and through it into his understanding. Influx into the will is into the occiput, because into the cerebellum, and hence it advances towards the fore part into the cerebrum, where the understanding has its seat, and when it comes by that way into the understanding, it then also comes into the sight, for man sees from his understanding. That such is the process of influx, has been taught me by much experience. Whether we say influx into the will, or into the love, is the same thing, since the will is the receptacle of love; it is also the same whether we say influx into the understanding or into faith, inasmuch as the understanding is the receptacle of faith.”—*A. E.* 61.

The love-principle, we are clearly taught, is the very ground-element of life—it is the foundation, the *esse*, of being—and in every created existence stands in immediate connection with the infinite and eternal fountain of life in the Deity. Why then should it not be a perennial reservoir for those interior vital influences which every moment sustain the involuntary functions both of the animal and vegetable worlds? Here then, we conceive, is the reason why the cerebellum never tires and never sleeps. It is because, as Swedenborg beautifully expresses it, “LOVE NEVER SLEEPS.” This is not only rhetorically, but philosophically or ontologically true. As love is the essence of life, it can no more sleep than life can be intermitted and yet still be life. It is eternally awake from its very nature. It is only the intellect that

sleeps, which is the external to the love, as the form is external to the essence.

With this view before us, we are prepared to answer the question as to the real seat of the conscious Ego or I—the essential personality of the intelligent being. It is not primarily in the intellectual principle, notwithstanding that the unconsciousness of sleep falls upon that principle, and it might seem that that was the elemental person—the real Ego—which loses its consciousness in sleep. But the fact is, there is a latent or interior consciousness, even in the profoundest sleep. A person asleep is not like a person dead. He has all the while an obscure consciousness that he is alive, and this consciousness must be referred to that principle which is the innermost substratum of his being; and that is his love, and not his understanding—his affection, and not his thought.

In the waking state the two portions of the brain act, in a great degree, conjointly with each other, as they are united, in their descent into the body, in the Medulla Oblongata and the Spinal Marrow, from which the nerves of sensation and motion spread themselves in every direction. The waking consciousness, therefore, of ourselves attaches to the whole fabric of our being when everything is in full play and at the height of its activity. In this state it is hardly possible to be aware of the importance of that part of the economy which is termed involuntary and which is governed by the cerebellum. We term it involuntary, which literally implies the absence of will, but in truth there is an interior will within this involuntary, just as there is an interior perception within the grosser understanding, and just as there is an influx from the celestial into the spiritual heaven. And the operation of this inner will, all unconscious as the intellect ordinarily is of it, is infinitely more perfect in the exquisite ends which it accomplishes than the volition of the understanding. Look at the phenomena of Instinct which flow from this source in the lower animals. Contemplate the achievements of the

bee and the beaver. See if anything in the proudest monuments of human reason and skill can compare with the products of their wondrous elaboration. In all this we behold the working of that science which is proper to affection, for all animals are embodied affections. Look also at the feats of somnambulists, with what amazing tact will they manage their limbs in climbing or walking over perilous places, when their judgment is asleep and they are solely under the government of the interior will as ruled by the cerebellum. Look again at the mysterious working of the involuntary organs of the body, prompted by the same interior power. And here I will cite the language of Swedenborg, the physiologist, on this head. The passage is from the *Animal Kingdom*, where he is describing the office of the lacteals: "Every fibre carries with it the animus or affections of its parent cerebrum or cerebellum, consequently different kinds of love, desire, hatred, and loathing, longings and antipathies, and all their ever various states. The mesenteric fibres, animated by the brains, are what command and cause the delicate mouths of the lacteals to seize with avidity whatever things are desired, and to reject with loathing whatever are disliked; and to open their little mouths, apply their little lips, and to drink with willingness in proportion to the intensity of the desire; or to corrugate, retract, and close their orifices, in proportion to the intensity of the loathing; for at the first approach, contact, or salute of any chyle or juice, whether desired or abhorred, they suddenly change their state." Can all these exquisite processes be carried on without intelligence? But what intelligence is it? The intellect of the cerebrum knows nothing of it—has nothing to do with it? It is the hidden wisdom of the affection or love-principle, the province of the cerebellum, whose actings are termed involuntary wholly with reference to the volitive determinations of the understanding, but which in reality involve the operations of a will as interior to the mere intellect as the soul is to the body.

If, then, the influx of the Divine love is more especi-

ally into the recipient human love, and this influx takes place during sleep, it may be fairly submitted as a question, whether the renovation of the system—the life and tone imparted to it—in the hours of repose be not owing mainly to this source. Nothing is more clearly taught by the teacher of the New Church, than that a man's love is the "fire of his life," that the vital heat of every human being is his life's love; and as this love manifests itself by heat, and heat is intimately related to the electric or galvanic element which seems to be that that acts upon the nerves, it may perhaps be reasonably suggested that this added nocturnal influx is one great means of furnishing to the cerebrum that measure of vital energy which is requisite to stimulate the organs of voluntary motion into their full activity. One thing, I think we may pronounce as certain—that every one's ruling love is more vivid and stirring in the earlier hours of the day. With what spirit and alacrity does the merchant, the mechanic, and the professional man enter upon the labors of the day in the morning compared with the lassitude and dullness of the evening. But this, it will perhaps be said, is owing to the refreshment of sleep during the night, which has wound up the spring of action that had run down in the day time. Granting this to be the case, still we ask, *how* does sleep accomplish this? What is the cause and the process? This is the very question I am considering. We all admit that there is a heightened activity of the ruling love after sleep. Is this an effect of the repaired energies of nature, or a cause? I would venture to maintain, on the ground of the New Church philosophy, that the nervous and muscular vigor which follows sleep is owing to the Divine vital influx into the love-principle during the night season. Certain it is, the increased supply of nervous influence must come from some source. Grant that it may be somewhat accumulated from the atmospheric auras by which we are surrounded, yet will this so adequately account for the effect as the supposition of a more copious inflowing of that life from the infinite

fountain which comes in connection with the heat of love, that celestial element that opens closed vessels and pours a vivifying current over the nervous organization?

That there is something peculiarly benignant, salutary, and sanatory in this influx during sleep, may be inferred from the fact of its healing and restoring effects in disease. Nothing is better known than the genial and health-restoring power of sleep upon many forms of disease. The aim of the physician in prescribing medicine is often in the first instance not to act directly upon the disease, but upon the system in such a way as to induce sleep. When sleep is procured and the cerebrum goes into abeyance, then the cerebellum is awake and busy in its restorative and invigorating processes. This is the true family physician—always at hand—and always ready to do his work without fee or reward. And so effective is this agency of the cerebellum that frequently no other remedy is needed than its own kindly action. Now as this action of the cerebellum must be an effect of some superior cause, I would ask whether in view of the Divine benevolence, there is anything more probable than that it is due to the bland and healing potency of that divine *medicamen* which comes in the train of the influent life and love of the Lord? Men may satisfy themselves with saying that this is a law of nature—a law of the animal economy—and smile the smile of pity and contempt at every endeavor to penetrate deeper into the essential *causes* of things, but this does not satisfy the enlightened man of the New Church. He is taught that there is no impiety and no impossibility in lifting the veil and looking in upon the hidden dynamics of the spiritual and celestial worlds as they flow into and permeate and actuate the natural world. Resting as they do in the firm assurance that all derived and dependent life in the universe is momentarily sustained by influx from its Divine Author, they cannot shrink from any fair inference from this fundamental doctrine, and they know nothing of complimenting the Creator out of his own dominions under the pretence that he may pro-

perly leave its affairs to be administered by the agency of certain vicegerent laws, instead of allowing himself to be perplexed with what Cudworth terms "the infinite negotiosity" that must oppress his intelligence.

Having thus endeavored to develope in some measure the laws of the animal economy on which the more palpable phenomena of sleep depend; having laid open to some extent, the several functions of the cerebrum and cerebellum in carrying on the various processes which mark the two diverse conditions of sleeping and waking; having shown that the voluntary movements of the system are governed by the cerebrum and the involuntary by the cerebellum—the one prevailing during the day, the other during the night; having taken occasion also to remark that on the principles laid down by Swedenborg we are taught to believe that the influx of the Divine Love or Life is more especially into the cerebellum as representing the emotional or affection principle of our nature, and that from this source really flows that supply of vital stimulus which goes to sustain the action of the anterior brain and its various dependences during the waking and working hours of day—it now remains to pursue the subject to some of its ulterior results, embracing among other things the phenomena of dreams. But before I come to this point there are one or two important items to be disposed of; and first, I observe that paramount question in regard to sleep is, what becomes of the intelligence during the sleeping state? To say that it is dormant—that it is in a state of abeyance—merely states a fact without affording a solution. The grand property of the intellect is thought, and we seem to have an instinctive perception that thought in its very nature is always active, and incapable of sleep. The idea of mind which does not incessantly think, strikes us like the idea of light which does not shine, or of fire which does not burn. We cannot well think of light ceasing to shine in any other way than of being completely extinguished. So of thought which ceases to think. Must it not suffer extinction? Here then is the problem. We have reason to



suppose, on the one hand, that the mind is essentially active, and on the other, that the function of conscious or voluntary thought is actually suspended during our sleeping moments. How is this to be accounted for? In other words, what is the precise psychological state of the understanding in sleep? We may describe the state of the brain in that condition with the utmost accuracy, and say that it loses its tension—its erect state—that it suffers a kind of relaxation or collapse, but this does not explain the mental phenomena in the case. The mind does not collapse, for it is not composed of substance to which that term can properly be applied. Again, then, we put the question, in what state is the understanding or intelligence during sleep? It is certainly some way in abeyance. What has happened to it? What has become of it? It does not act through the medium of the senses. You may raise the eye-lids of a sleeping person and present any object before the eye, and it is not seen. There is no more vision than there is at a window, when there is no eye there to look out. A person standing at a window will see a procession passing by in the street, but if he withdraws from the window or the room to the rear of the house, the spectacle of course is not seen. The seeing power or agent has retired—he is not there. When a man is awake his spirit may be said to be at the window of his house. It takes cognizance of the external world through the avenues of sight, hearing, smell, &c. It is alive and alert; it is present at its outposts. But in sleep it is the reverse. The windows and the doors are there and it may be are open. But the tenant is apparently not there, and it is a fair question, what has become of him? Is he not really absent? In other words, do not the voluntary powers of intelligence and action *retire* from their usual seat, the anterior region of the brain, and gather themselves into some more interior recess of the body? What that hidden apartment is I shall soon suggest; meanwhile I offer the conjecture that in sleep the life of the intellect is temporarily merged in that of the affections. This we submit as the true solution of the problem of sleep. The

understanding sinks conjugially into the bosom of the will during that mysterious syncope of its functions. As the tender brood at night gather themselves under the wing of the mother bird, so the thoughts collect themselves under the panoply of the inward life of love. Or as the numerous passengers on board a floating palace on one of our great western rivers, after roving over the boat and promenading the deck during the day, retreat at the hour of rest to their dormitories in the lower cabin, so the busy powers of the understanding, which have traversed the fields of creation or the walks of business during the day, descend at night into the depths of the soul, beyond the range of the exterior consciousness, and there seek the refreshing tranquillity of that hallowed inner chamber which is the resort of celestial visitants, and where all the choicer things of the spirit are stored up. And as all the complicated machinery that propels the boat is constantly at work while the passengers court repose in their berths, so the understanding sinks into its sleep, if we may so term it, while all the vital enginery of the body is in unceasing operation.

But the inquiry here urges itself, if the understanding retires, during sleep, from the cerebrum, whither does it retire? Is there any other brain in the body which will hospitably entertain it as a guest during the night? We are aware of the difficulty of conveying correct ideas of spiritual functions by applying to them terms appropriate to material subjects. There is perhaps somewhat incongruous to the nature of the mind in speaking of its translocation from one portion of the body to another, and yet it is a well known fact, there is a great nervous centre, termed the *Solar Plexus*, sometimes termed a *second brain*, situated in the immediate vicinity of the stomach, and to which, in certain conditions, the seat of sensation is undoubtedly transferred. It is well known that in the mesmeric sleep what is termed *the pit of the stomach* becomes, as it were, the substitute of the brain, and persons in that condition will assure us that they both see and hear from that region. There is, to all appearance, for

the time, a transfer of the sensorium from the brain to this inferior province of the body, and it is hither, as we incline to believe, that the intelligence betakes itself, as to a dormitory, during the hours of repose. I am well aware that a somewhat minute knowledge of anatomy is needed to do full justice to this suggestion; but as the fact is unquestionable that there is an apparent recession of the understanding from its ordinary tenement, is it indulging unduly the spirit of hypothesis to suggest that it travels downward along the nervous pathway of the *Medulla Oblongata*, and having reached its goal pernociates there in the *solar* sanctum of the thorax?

Shall this be accounted a mere vagary of fancy—a theory as idle as many of the phantasms which play through the mind when subdued by the opiates of Morpheus? Look at the analogies of nature. Do not the juices of plants sink during the night towards the roots and rise again in the morning? How is it else that the morning glory closes its petals in the night season and opens them to the solar beams in the morning? The vegetative life which retired downwards during the night rises up again as the light of day greets it.

How easy, then, how fair and legitimate the inference, that the intellectual department of our being withdraws itself inwardly during sleep and enters into conjunction with the more latent life of the will or affection, and thus brings itself more fully within the range of that influx of the Divine Life and Love which comes especially in contact with the inner essential element of existence, which is the affection. It is there or thence, if we mistake not, that the wearied powers of thought obtain the renewal of their activity, and this is communicated to the brain; so that instead of the brain's being refreshed and invigorated by sleep and imparting this vigor to the mind, the process is directly the reverse; it is the renovation of the mental powers acquired during their sojourn in the sanctuary of the affections, that imparts new vigor and activity to the brain; for every one acquainted with the true doctrine of influx knows that its inflow is

not from the natural to the spiritual, but from the spiritual to the natural. As it is not then the brain which quickens the intellect in the morning, but the intellect which gives tone to the brain, how does the intellect acquire this new stock of vitality but from the new supply of influx which it receives while thus indrawn into closer communion with the interior life presided over by the regency of the cerebellum?

We have here then, if we mistake not, a very important solution of one of the most striking phenomena of sleep; and although we do not find it enunciated in so many words by Swedenborg, yet it is fully authorized, as we conceive, by what he does teach respecting the doctrine of influx. It is a clear deduction from very clear premises abounding in his writings. We may accordingly see in this view another analogy between Sleep and Death. In death, Swedenborg informs us, "the vital substances are separated from the man, in whatever part they are, even if they were enclosed in a thousand intricate windings." So in sleep, the image of death, the permeating thought is drawn in from all its ramifications through the anterior brain into the interior life of the soul, and then is raised up again into a kind of spiritual resurrection.

Such then we suppose to be the true philosophy as it relates to the mental faculties. It is a retiring, or withdrawing, or indrawing, of the external man into the internal. The suspension of thought is rather apparent than real. It is somewhat like the sun, which appears to set, but really does not. The understanding, in that mysterious pause of its conscious activity, merely enters, for the time, into closer conjunction with the will, just as we might suppose the blood of the lungs to be drawn into the heart. Look again at the subject by the light of analogy. Is not the endeared intercourse and domiciliary cohabitation of married partners an ultimate of interior principles, and what are these principles but Love and Wisdom, or Will and Understanding? And how much short of a direct sanction to this idea is the following

paragraph from the treatise on the "Divine Love and Wisdom" (n. 402):

*"That love or the will prepares a house or bridal apartment, for a future spouse, which is wisdom or the understanding. In the created universe and all its parts, there is a marriage of good and truth, and this, because good is of love and truth is of wisdom, and these two are in the Lord, by whom all things were created. How this marriage exists in man may be seen, as in a glass, in the conjunction of the heart with the lungs; for the heart corresponds to love or good, and the lungs to wisdom or truth. From that conjunction it may be seen, how love or the will, betroths to it wisdom or the understanding, and afterwards takes it to wife, or marries it: love betroths wisdom, in that it prepares a house or bridal apartment for wisdom, and it takes wisdom to wife, in that it conjoins it to itself by affections, and then operates wisdom with it in that house. That it is so cannot be fully described, except in spiritual language, because love and wisdom, and the will and understanding, are spiritual things, which indeed may be set forth in natural language, but only obscurely to the perception, because of the want of knowledge of the nature of love and wisdom, and also of the affections of good, and of the affections of wisdom, which are affections of truth. But yet the nature of the betrothing and marriage of love and wisdom, or of the will and understanding, may be seen by the parallelism that exists by virtue of their correspondence with the heart and lungs. It is the same with the latter as with the former; so much so, that there is no difference, except that one is spiritual and the other natural. From the heart, therefore, and the lungs, it is evident, that the heart first forms the lungs, and afterwards conjoins itself to them; it forms the lungs in the foetus, and conjoins itself to them after birth: this the heart does in its house, the breast, where their dwelling-place is, separated from the rest of the body by a partition, called the diaphragm, and by a membrane enclosing them, called the pleura. It is the same with love and wisdom, or with the will and understanding."*

In accordance with this analogy, what more rational than that this spiritual conjugal pair should more especially abide together when the shades of night preclude the activity of the understanding from putting itself forth in the sphere of the outer world. And so, to resume again the comparison of the sun, the understanding may be said to be in the morning "as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber and rejoicing as a strong man to run a race." This race he runs in the active businesses and duties of the day.

Taking now for granted the truth of what Swedenborg teaches respecting the two great constituents of our nature, and their inter-relation with each other, we can no doubt perceive that the more perfectly they can act together, the higher is the psychological state of the being. The man is then more in the state of a disembodied spirit, and the more perfect are the mental processes that often take place during one's sleeping hours. Consequently all his faculties are heightened greatly above the natural plane of their operation. Every process is carried on with a clearness and vividness and rapidity, of which we ordinarily have no conception. All the mental powers are quickened, acuminated, and intensified to an astonishing degree, so that in that state one can perceive more in one minute than he could utter by the lips in many hours.

Now in regard to the affections and the intellect, while we do not say that they ever act in entire separation from each other, for this is just as impossible as that the heart and lungs should act separately from each other, we yet maintain that there is such a thing as a more intimate conjunction than ordinary of these two distinguishing principles, and that this takes place in sleep, the consequence of which is a more than usually exalted state of the inner man—more vivid conceptions—more luminous perceptions—and in fine a more sublimated and spiritual state of the soul. Especially are we taught to believe that the understanding by coming into the interior life of the will comes into the sphere of the interior memory. In this memory are treasured up all the more sacred archives of a man's moral history. And only think what an accumulation is there of indestructible materials lodged in this inner repository of the spirit, from which not one item perishes to all eternity. This is the book of every man's life which is hereafter to be opened, and out of which he is to be judged.

Taking this as a fact for granted, that there is this deeper and more internal memory in every man, we shall be able, I think, to account for a well-known psy-

chological fact in regard to the sensations of drowning persons. No fact is better established than that in the crisis of suffocation there is a wonderful waking up of the memory, so that oftentimes the entire train of one's history even from early childhood, is vividly recalled in its minutest items. Now the question is, how is this fact to be accounted for? Let us see if we cannot reach the solution by tracing the process physiologically. In the first place, the stomach is filled with water, and by the atmospherical air being excluded respiration is extinguished, and when a man ceases to respire he ceases to think, according to the common laws of thought; for Swedenborg has shown that the action of the lungs has just as much relation to the power of the thought as that of the heart has to the exercise of affection, the heart corresponding to the love, and the lungs to the understanding. The lungs, then, ceasing to act, the power of thought and sensation recedes from the cerebrum, and retreats inwardly to the will, and there coming in contact, so to speak, with the central love or life, every perception becomes vivid and the internal memory awakes, and so heightened is the activity of every power, and so amazingly rapid every movement of the mind, that a whole life seems to be arrayed before one as in a moment. At the same time, persons in these circumstances generally say they experience no pain when in the midst of their revived recollections. The reason is doubtless the same as that which prevents us from feeling bodily sensations in our sleep. The sentient power is departed from the brain with the thinking power, and as in the case of plenary magnetism all the outer senses and the nervous sensibility are in abeyance. But they feel great pain in being brought to, because the power of sensation is then returning to the brain.

The state of drowning, then, we perceive is strikingly analogous, in several respects, to the state of sleep, and I adduce it in this connection solely in order to illustrate and confirm my main position in regard to the actual state of the intellect during sleep as having retired from

the outer to the inner chambers of the soul, and there having merged and conjoined itself with the more interior and essential principles of life. One can hardly refuse to admit that it rests upon something more stable than mere hypothesis. We see here the testimony of positive facts, and if any theory will fully and adequately account for the facts involved in it, why is it not entitled to take its place, as a genuine scientific induction?

But we proceed to some ulterior phases of the general subject with a view to certain important results.

The state of sleep is not properly of the body. Indeed, what is there of the body that really sleeps? Are not all its functions going on as usual? Does not the heart beat? Do not the lungs heave? Does not the stomach and the digestive apparatus keep in active operation during the night as well as the day? There is doubtless some degree of relaxation in some of the structures, but this does not amount to sleep. The body sleeps only in death. What is it, then, that does sleep? We have already seen that the most interior principles of our being, the affections and emotions, ruled by the cerebellum, do not sleep. Here, then, we have the most interior and the most exterior portions of our nature exempt from the operation of this mysterious law. It is some middle principle—something that is interior to the body and yet exterior to the inmost mind—which feels the touch of the leaden sceptre of *Somnus*. Now that there is an external to the inmost of every man, spirit, and angel, is among the most emphatic teachings of the revelations of the New Church. To this external or physical principle the senses by which we are related to the outward world, belong; and the senses, we know, are especially sealed up in sleep. But if this external, which is not the body, may sleep *in* the body, what sufficient reason can be given why it should not sleep *out of* the body? That is to say, in other words, that spirits are equally subject to the law of sleep as man? This would no doubt strike one at first blush as a very strange and astounding announcement; but think of the



grounds of it. A spirit certainly has an internal and an external, and as it is the external which sleeps in this world, why should it not sleep also in the next? The psychical powers even of an angel cannot remain forever strung up to the highest pitch of activity without some remission. There must be alternate seasons of action and repose. Why not then of sleeping and waking? And what can reasonably be objected to the statement of Swedenborg that follows?

"Certain souls, fresh arrived from the world, who desire to see the glory of the Lord, before they are in such a state as to be capable of beholding it, are cast, as to their exterior senses and inferior faculties, into a kind of sweet sleep, and then their interior senses and faculties are raised into an extraordinary degree of wakefulness, and thus they are let into the glory of heaven. But as soon as wakefulness is restored to the exterior senses and faculties, they return to their former state."—*A. C.* 1982.

We have here an important clue as to the true rationale of dreams. The external of a spirit is laid asleep and then his internal is developed, and comes into converse with celestial things. There is the waking up of a more interior man, which then enjoys mere interior senses. So in the sleep of a man's external there is a similar waking up of interior perceptions, by which we hold converse with the objects and scenery of the spiritual world. It matters not that we call this the working of the imagination in sleep. We affix, for the most part, but very little definite meaning to the word imagination. It expresses our ignorance rather than our knowledge. It is simply the name of a mental phenomenon of the true nature of which we have ordinarily but little conception. What we know is, that we are conscious of beholding objects as distinctly as in our waking state, and yet it is with an eye wholly different from the outward or natural eye; and sounds are heard with another than the natural ear. It is true, indeed, that the objects seen and heard are within ourselves, and yet they are apparently projected outwardly and are objectively beheld. See, then, in this a proof irresistible, that there are in-

ward and spiritual senses, and that the shaking off of this mortal coil leaves the man a perfectly organized being, endowed with perceptive powers completely adapted to the objects with which he is there surrounded. As the senses there are spiritual, the objects are spiritual, and yet substantial; for to say that an eye, whether natural or spiritual, sees anything that is not a substance, is to say that it sees *nothing*. What, then, are the phenomena of dreaming, but a standing and living demonstration of the truth of another life, and a nightly recurring specimen of the mode of existence in that life? Shall we not recognize in this, then, another moral end of the ordinance of sleep? It is to naturalize us beforehand to citizenship in another country, in which we are ere long to take up our abode. It is to afford us preliminary glimpses of that world which is soon to open upon us with all that is blissful or baleful, according as we have treasured up within ourselves the material which shall develop itself in the beatific surroundings of the angels or the hideous environments of the infernals. Viewed in this light, our sleep introduces us into the true world of reality and stability. We *here* awake into the land of dreams and shadows. The two states, to an intelligent apprehension, change their character. In the image of death we find the true theatre of life. It is only in the world around us that we walk in a vain show—intoxicating our senses with a wild phantasmagoria, except just so far as the life and joy and honor and glory of the spirit-world is the end of action, affection, acquisition, and thought.

But to return to the topic of the sleeping of spirits in the other life. Recent souls, it appears, or souls recently transferred to the spirit-world, have their external or lower faculties cast into a deep sleep, and, in that condition, an influx is received into their interior minds, revealing to them the glories of heaven. How does this differ from dreaming? But are not these views of heavenly glory insinuated by angels and the superior orders of spiritual beings? Swedenborg teaches that, as

one class of spirits is flowing into the minds of men on earth, so others of higher, that is more interior, genius flow into *them*: and if a dream be produced in the mind of a spirit by another higher spirit flowing in, it surely is not difficult to conceive that a dream may be excited by a spirit of the spiritual world in the mind of one who is yet abiding in the flesh. We may, then, for the present, set it down as a sound conclusion, that dreams are, at least sometimes, produced by the action of minds in another world, put forth upon minds in this world. As the spiritual part of man's nature is more fully developed in that state; as his interiors are then comparatively opened, spirits and angels have more sensible access to the soul in dreams than at other times, and this we are given to understand is one reason why such peculiar guardianship is exercised over man in his sleep to keep away the infestations of evil spirits. The state of sleep is a state of peculiar exposure to malign influences emanating from the other world, of which we are sufficiently advised in the following extracts. "Evil spirits have the greatest and most burning desire to infest and assault man during sleep; but he is then particularly under the Lord's keeping; for love never sleeps. The spirits who infest are miserably punished." Again he says, "I have been instructed that there is a necessity that man should sleep in safety, for otherwise the human race would perish."

This state of sleep, therefore, is one that calls for a special tutelage on the part of Infinite Love towards his dependent children. He accordingly takes them in that state into his own immediate care and keeping. As a fond parent who wakes and watches over a sleeping child that is in any circumstances of peril, while lying defenceless in its cradle, so the Lord sets, as it were, a double guard around his children while buried in repose, thus enabling us to see a new emphasis in the words of the Psalmist, "so He giveth his beloved sleep." It would seem as if the Divine Cerebellum, keeping its everlasting vigils, was incessantly doing that for the

moral universe in this respect which the human cerebellum is doing for the human economy, while its needful slumbers hold its self-protective powers in abeyance. How strikingly is this tutelary care set forth in the following paragraph :

“ The angelic spirits who dwell on the confines of the paradisiacal abodes, are they who insinuate delightful dreams ; to whom is also allotted the office of watching over certain men during sleep, to prevent the infestations of evil spirits. This office they discharge with the utmost delight, insomuch that there is an emulation amongst them who shall approach ; and they love to excite in man the joys and delights which they observe in his affection and temper. These angelic spirits are of those who, in the life of the body, delighted and loved, by every means and endeavor, to render the life of others happy. They belong to the province of the cerebellum, because the cerebellum, as I have learnt, is in a wakeful state during sleep, when the cerebrum is asleep. The men of the Most Ancient Church had thence their dreams, with a perception of what they signified ; from whom, in a great measure, came the representatives and significatives of the ancients, under which things of a deep and hidden nature were conveyed.”—*A. C.* 1977.

The gratitude inspired by this reflection upon the peculiar sanctity pertaining to the state of sleep, and of the guards with which it is fenced around by the Lord's protecting providence, is wrought into a more lively glow in view of the tender care exercised over sleeping infancy. The physical necessity which requires for infants more sleep than is needed by adults, delightfully merges into a spiritual prerogative, that we can scarcely appreciate as it deserves. Infants are the special subjects of the influx of heaven through the celestial angels, and it is through the gateway of the cerebellum that these heavenly visitors enter, and breathe the affections of innocence which so often light up their little faces with a radiance that amounts almost to a transfiguration. No figure of speech, but a sober and actual verity do we recognize in the saying that finds vogue in the humbler walks of life, that the sleeping smile of an infant betokens the whisper of angels. “ It has been told me,” says Swedenborg, “ from heaven, that infants are particularly under the auspices of the Lord, and that their influx is from the inmost heaven, where there is a state of innocence, and that the influx passes

through their interiors, and that in passing through, it affects them by innocence, and that hence innocence is exhibited in their faces and gestures."

Finally, how precious the consideration, that this protecting ægis is spread before and over *all* his human family without exception. That refreshment and invigoration of which I have spoken, is imparted to all men without distinction of character. As the determining power of the will is quiescent during sleep, and men cannot, of set purpose, prevent or mal-appropriate the influent divine good, so there is no doubt a benign influence thus exerted which goes to moderate and restrain the wickedness of wicked men, while at the same time there is no infringement of their essential freedom. How interesting the thought! How endearing this view of the divine beneficence! That the infinitely good and gracious Lord should reserve to himself this mode of access to the hearts of the children of men, even the most reckless and abandoned, and should gently distil upon them a dew of heaven tending to soften the obduracy of impenitence, and check the impetuous career of evil so far as it can be done without detriment to free agency, which is a jewel too sacred to be touched even by the Divine Donor himself. We may not, it is true, see this influence resulting in regeneration, which requires the co-operation of the whole man with all his powers, yet there is no doubt that the state of sleep does contribute more or less to the amelioration and improvement of their state, and that they are at any rate prevented from falling into such depths of iniquity and degradation as they are inclined to when their evil and infernal proprium is in full play.

Let us, then, bow in ever deepening and adoring acknowledgment of those infinite treasures of wisdom and goodness which are being continually poured out upon the children of men both sleeping and waking. Their affluence is not more exhaustless than their effluence is unceasing, and we have only to submit our souls to their transforming power to be enabled to say, "I will both lay me down and sleep, for thou only makest me to dwell in safety."

## THE NEW CHURCH SYSTEM REFERABLE SOLELY TO A DIVINE ORIGIN.

[N. C. Repos., April to July, 1855.]

IN the estimate formed of a Revelation professing to have emanated from the Lord of the Universe, there are always difficulties to be met and objections to be overcome arising from the force of inveterate prejudices, connected with our former traditional or educational belief. So long as the bonds of ancestral dogmas are upon us, and the cherished reminiscences of childhood and youth consecrate the creeds imbibed at that early period, it is only with the utmost effort that we can so far emancipate our minds from the influence of these causes as to bestow a candid consideration upon any system of doctrines claiming to be of divine origin, when its teachings come in conflict with our pre-established forms of faith. It is evermore a rare achievement by which we ascend beyond the ordinary plane of thought, and take an intelligent or charitable survey of the religious domain occupied by another sect. But this, difficult as it is, is easier than to conceive the possibility of an *entirely new* dispensation of religious truth—the ushering in a positively new era of spiritual knowledge. Our religious tenets become mental fixtures, and we know not how to remove them, or how to remove ourselves from them. We are both incapacitated and intimidated from extending our range of research beyond the limits within which it has been usually confined; and if we are tempted to venture out where we have never been before—if we are prompted in our intellectual voyaging to cast the plummet in unknown depths, or to double strange headlands and promontories in our course—we seem to experience a repetition of the fabled lot of Vasco de Gama, who, when doubling the Cape of Good Hope, on his way to the Indies, was met according to

the poetic fancy of Camoens by an appalling, weird, and gigantic form that arose from the bosom of the ocean, and awfully beckoned back the adventurous navigator, who had dared to transgress the boundaries of prior discovery. So the Genius of Tradition may be conceived as rising in terrific aspect, and frowning down every aspiration that would prompt to a breaking away from her dominion and traversing other and unknown regions.

But our main position is, that nothing is more difficult than to conceive rightly of, and estimate fairly, a form of religious truth very diverse from that in which we have been trained, and which has received the sanction of past generations as well as of the present. There are a thousand influences at work to withhold the individual from outstripping the collective mind of the age.

It may, however, be remarked, that the same causes which prevent one from appreciating a system of doctrines entirely new, operate also to prevent such a system being originated in the first instance. There is, in the necessity of the case, a certain limitation of the human powers. They cannot rise indefinitely high above the surrounding level. Mad. de Stael remarks that the degree to which any one, however highly gifted, can surpass the standard of his age, may usually be measured beforehand, not precisely, perhaps, but approximately.

So in the matter of a code of religious doctrines and revelations promulgated at any particular era, and bearing on its front the imprint of an alleged divine origin. One mode of bringing such a claim to the test is to estimate the degree of its advancement beyond the measure of the times in which it appears. If it goes far beyond all that could reasonably have been anticipated under the circumstances, we can scarcely resist the conviction that such disclosures are to be referred to something higher than human sagacity, wisdom, or cunning. For certain it is, as a general fact, that all great minds are exponents rather of their own than of future ages, and that they are tethered more or less to a fixed circumference in revolving about their centre. It is so in science,

where the boundaries are enlarged, not by the majestic stride of an individual mind, but by successive accessions, one pushing a little ahead of his predecessor, and another a little ahead of him, and so on, till the whole present field has been gradually won.

It is by such a test that we earnestly desire the doctrines of the New Church to be tried. We who have carefully pondered the distinguishing character of that system, do not hesitate to hold it up as containing features which can be accounted for only on the ground of their absolute truth. They constitute, in our judgment, a problem which no theory of human ingenuity can solve; and the reason why we rest so confidently in this belief is, that the system surpasses so utterly and entirely everything that could have been rationally expected of the human mind in the age which gave it birth. To us, accordingly, the idea of its having been the product merely of the unassisted intellect of man, is no less extravagant than that of the earth we inhabit having been the product of human potency and elaboration.

But this, we are aware, is the expression of a bare opinion, or rather conviction, which it were vain to hope would establish itself in other minds without the support of adequate evidence. We are bound in fairness to adduce corroborating testimony in behalf of our position on this head, and such proof we now propose to offer, regarding it, of course, as a settled point, that if it be shown that the New Church system is beyond the reach of man's ability to devise, we thereby inforce the inference that it owes its origin to a Divine source. In taking this method of discussing the subject, we naturally furnish an answer to the question, What reason have we to believe that Emanuel Swedenborg was invested with a divine commission? Every one will be able to judge for himself, from the data afforded, how far to yield his credence to the claims asserted.

And it is especially on this head that satisfaction is craved by the somewhat inquisitive public mind of the



day. That which stumbles multitudes of honest inquirers is this laying claim, by Swedenborg, to a divine revelation—this coming before the world in the eighteenth century in the character of a prophet or seer. Would he but lay aside his claim on this score, and take his stand on the same platform with Luther, and Calvin, and Wesley, and Edwards, and Dwight, and propound his doctrines *as his*, hundreds would no doubt give him a hearing forthwith. But he is summarily put without the pale of reverent regard by the fact of his assumption on this score, which amounts, it is said, to a virtual denial that the Canon of Scripture is closed, thus outraging the universal sentiment of Christendom. It is therefore evidently of the utmost importance that this point should be established—that the credentials of a mission, an embassy, from Heaven—should be made out in his behalf.

Still we do not suppose that the most logical and unimpeachable course of argument on this head will necessarily of itself command the assent of the intellect. For it is one of the peculiar and distinguishing traits and teachings of the system, that the reception of truth is dependent upon the state of the affections rather than of the perceptions of the intellect. Apart from them, we have no assurance of the triumph of truth over the falsities which it has to encounter. And this feature of it we may reckon among the evidences of the heavenly origin of the doctrine, that it puts the prospect and the probability of its own reception, not upon the degree of evidence which it carries to the understanding, but upon the previous state of the affections as to the love of goodness and the love of truth. Would this have been the case with a system devised by the wit of man, and depending not upon divine influx, but upon human intelligence for reception?

But this consideration is comparatively weak and trifling when placed by the side of others to which we design to advert. And here let us say in the outset that the system of religious truth set forth by Swedenborg,

does *profess*, at least, to be a fulfilment of Scripture prophecy. It assumes to be a substantiating or realizing *in actu* of the symbolic shadows of the sacred oracles, under which were announced the glorious things that were to be ministered to the children of men in the latter day. Now the question is, whether this is well founded or not. Is the system of doctrine and life which Swedenborg has promulgated, in deed and in truth the very system which was predicted by prophets and psalmists, or is it a mere suppositious affair—a fabrication—a changeling system surreptitiously introduced and substituted in place of the genuine? It is known to those that are somewhat conversant with the history of theological opinion, particularly in its polemical aspects, that a certain class of deistical writers, of whom Anthony Collins was the head, took the position that Jesus of Nazareth was not the true Messiah announced in the Jewish Scriptures, but that being of a shrewd and aspiring genius, he went to work to adapt himself to the scope of all the inspired predictions, types, and ceremonies, and that by means of a transcendent astuteness and unwearied assiduity, he actually succeeded in palming upon a portion of his countrymen the strong persuasion that he was indeed the veritable personage predicted in their sacred books, and who was to conduct the nation of Israel to the height of their promised renown. And not only so, but that owing to the operation of causes deep laid in the ground-work of human nature, and by a remarkable train of providential circumstances, the belief has been perpetuated among a vast body of the race to the present day; while at the same time it was all a fallacy—a “counterfeit presentment” of the *bona fide* personage intended by the inditing spirit to whose inspiration the Scriptures are referable.

Now it is by a procedure somewhat analogous to this, that Swedenborg may be supposed to have brought forward his peculiar scheme of a New Church, and foisted it into the place of that which was legitimately to have been expected. And certainly, on the supposition that

his voluminous writings are not true, but are merely an immense congeries of falsities, it must be admitted that something like this was his aim, and that to this end all his almost superhuman labors with the pen were directed.

But reflect for a moment on what is involved in this hypothesis. He finds, on opening the sacred page, that the Lord through his prophet declares or announces, "Behold, I make all things *new*," and again, "I saw a *new* heaven and a *new* earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away." These annunciations are to be in some way fulfilled, and he resolves to exco-gitate and publish a system of doctrines and life, which shall as nearly as possible correspond with the purport of these sublime declarations. You will observe that it must be a system which is properly to be denominated *new*; one in which *all things* are to be new—a complete renovation and transformation being involved in the announcement. Now to say nothing of the stupendous presumption of thus attempting, notwithstanding his intrinsic littleness, weakness, and insignificance, to carry into completion the divine counsels—to say nothing of the daring impiety of thus virtually putting a forged document beneath a genuine seal, which the known devout and exemplary character of the man would utterly forbid—what would be the probability, left to himself, of making out a system which would be complete, coherent, and consistent, from beginning to end, and that too extending, as it does, through thousands and thousands of pages? Would not the advanced progress of such a scheme often forget its beginning, and the most glaring discrepancies between the different parts occur? Is it conceivable that any human mind, relying solely on its own resources, should have constructed a system which would bear the searching inquest of all our minds, and should challenge, in fact, their strictest ordeal? Yet this is what Swedenborg has done. He has professed to realize a prophetic ideal of a church and a kingdom, and boldly calls upon the world to compare the an-

nouncement with the alleged fulfilment. He points to the mould given from heaven, and then to the statue which he has run in it, and demands whether the correspondence be not perfect. We say, indeed, that it is, and that, too, because both mould and statue are in fact from the same hand, as we hold that Swedenborg thought and wrote under a divine guidance; but the case is put to those who at present deny him such a supernal dictation, but regard him as simply acting out his own impulses, and giving to the world not a genuine, but a spurious revelation.

Now we would fain have this matter viewed in its appropriate light, and then let every one judge for himself, whether he can rationally attribute such a body of doctrine and revelation to a merely human origin. You will observe that an entirely *new* dispensation was to be announced and ushered in, and we can form some adequate idea of what would be requisite in order to accomplish such an august result. A complete change was to be wrought in men's ideas of sacred things. All the old and long established forms of thought on religious themes were to be remodelled, and yet the inspired Word was to remain as ever the grand depository of Divine truth and the criterion of all doctrine. The oldness of the letter was to be preserved in perfect consistency with a developed newness of spirit. How could this be unless a deeper and more interior meaning were developed from it; and how, again, could this be done, unless an underlying law were discovered which should redeem the interpretation from the charge of arbitrary and fanciful? And here it is that we encounter the grand problem to be solved? How is this law of interpretation to be discovered? Where shall the intellect be found competent to elicit from the written revelation a sense which shall be the basis of a *new* dispensation—an order of things answering to the high strains of prophecy bearing upon the glory of the Lord's coming Kingdom? We say without hesitation that such a discovery would be, to human wit or wisdom, simply impossible. To be convinced of this, we have but to re-

mind ourselves of what the law actually is. It is the law of the relation of the spiritual and the natural worlds—the former as the world of causes, the latter as the world of effects. We can appreciate it now that it is made known, and can see how utterly it would have transcended the utmost reach of man's unaided powers. How was the mystery of the spiritual world to be laid open, except by a species of translation thither on the part of the revealer? An actual intromission into that sphere of existence was imperatively requisite if its sublime arcana were to be developed, and that, too, not merely to blazon its momentous facts and phenomena, but more especially to bring back from that unexplored region the key to the interpretation of the internal sense of the Word. This accordingly forms a prominent feature of the function which Swedenborg claims for himself, as a divinely commissioned messenger from heaven. On this head he speaks himself as follows :

“ That the Word in the letter is written by appearances and correspondences, and that, therefore, there is in every part of it a spiritual sense, in which the truth is in its light, and the sense of the letter in the shade, was shown in the chapter concerning the SACRED SCRIPTURE. Lest, therefore, the man of the New Church, like the man of the old church, should wander in the shade, in which the sense of the letter of the Word is, especially concerning heaven and hell, and concerning his life after death, and here concerning the coming of the Lord, it has pleased the Lord to open the sight of my spirit, and thus to let me into the spiritual world, and not only to give me to speak with spirits and angels, and with relations and friends, but with kings and princes, who have departed from the natural world, but also to see the stupendous things of heaven, and the miserable things of hell ; and thus that man does not live in some unknown place of the earth, nor fly about blind and dumb in the air, or in empty space ; but that he lives as a man in a substantial body, in a much more perfect state, if he comes among the blessed, than before, when he lived in the material body. Therefore, lest man should become more deeply grounded in the opinion concerning the destruction of the visible heaven and habitable earth, and thus concerning the spiritual world, from ignorance, which is the source of naturalism, and then, at the same time, atheism, which, at this day, among the learned, has begun to take root in the interior rational mind, should, like a mortification in the flesh, spread itself around more widely, even into his external mind, from which he speaks, it has been enjoined upon me by the Lord, to promulgate some

of the things seen and heard, both concerning HEAVEN AND HELL, and concerning the LAST JUDGMENT, and also to explain the APOCALYPSE, where the coming of the Lord, and the former heaven, and the new heaven and the holy Jerusalem, are treated of; from which, when read and understood, any one may see what is meant there by the coming of the Lord, and by the new heaven, and by the new Jerusalem."—*T. C. R.*

All this we can now see to have been an absolutely necessary step in the accomplishment of the ends of the Divine Wisdom in the establishing of a New Church in the world, and we have each to judge for ourselves of the probability of any sane, sober, and intelligent man's claiming such a prerogative for himself—especially a man of cool, reflective temperament like Swedenborg. We can only judge rightly on this score by giving due consideration to the obstacles standing in the way of such an assertion. He could not but be aware of the strength of the impression throughout all classes of Christendom, that the Sacred Canon is closed, and that no farther discoveries from the interior, such as were made to the prophets, were any longer to be anticipated. He could not be insensible to the fact that with the great mass of Christians such a pretence would be fatal to his pretensions, as it would go counter to a first principle rooted and grounded in the religious mind of the age, and would therefore bar out completely all title to examination.

Yet in the face of all this the herald of the New Dispensation<sup>8</sup> lays claim, in the most explicit manner, to direct revelations, and even more than intimates that it was indispensably necessary, according to the principles of order, that the Second Coming of the Lord should be effected through the instrumentality of a man divinely qualified and endowed for the work. Hear his testimony to this effect.

*"That this Coming is effected, in the first instance, through the instrumentality of a man divinely qualified and endowed for this sacred office.—Since the Lord cannot manifest Himself in person, as has been shown just above, and yet He has foretold that He would come and establish a New Church, which is the New Jerusalem, it follows that*

he is to do it by means of a man, who is able not only to receive the doctrines of this church with his understanding, but also to publish them by the press. That the Lord has manifested Himself before me, his servant, and sent me on this office, and that, after this, he opened the sight of my spirit, and thus let me into the spiritual world, and gave me to see the heavens and the hells, and also to speak with angels and spirits, and this now continually for many years, I testify in truth; and also that, from the first day of that call, I have not received anything which pertains to the doctrines of that church from any angel, but from the Lord alone, while I read the Word."—*T. C. R.* 779.

"In your gracious letter, you ask, how I attained to be in society with angels and spirits, and whether that privilege can be communicated from one person to another. Deign, then, to receive favorably this answer. The Lord our Saviour had foretold that He would come again into the world, and that he would establish there a New Church. He has given this prediction in the Apocalypse, xxi. and xxii., and also in several places in the Evangelists. But *as he cannot come again into the world in person*, it was necessary that he should do it by means of a man, who should not only receive the doctrine of this New Church in his understanding, but also publish it by printing; and as the Lord had prepared me for this office from my infancy, He has manifested himself before me, His servant, and sent me to fill it. This took place in the year 1743. He afterwards opened the sight of my spirit, and thus introduced me into the spiritual world, and granted me to see the heavens and many of their wonders, and also the hells, and to speak with angels and spirits, and this continually for twenty-seven years. I declare in all truth that such is the fact. This favor of the Lord, in regard to me, has only taken place for the sake of the New Church which I have mentioned above, the doctrine of which is contained in my writings."—*Documents*, p. 138.

The especial point of consideration here is, the antecedent improbability of such a stupendous claim being made by a sensible man in the face of all that prejudice and incredulity which it would be sure to encounter. To think of a frail worm of the dust lifting up its littleness to the height of an asserted participation in the Second Advent of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ! To think that a mortal man should presume to predicate of himself a necessary instrumentality in the accomplishment of such an event! What, on the first announcement, could strike us as a more astounding absurdity and impiety combined? Should we not as soon

expect that his agency would have been claimed to be a necessary condition on the original creation of the universe? Yet this is the claim which the Swedish Seer unhesitatingly advances before the world! This claim and its dependencies constitute the hinge on which the whole of the present argument turns. We maintain that the leading doctrines and disclosures of the system, though rational and credible in themselves when once fairly apprehended, are so utterly remote from all that could have been expected *a priori* to enter into the range of any man's thought, who should have set himself to the work of fabricating a spurious code of religious faith, that the problem becomes vastly greater by referring them to a human than to a divine origin. Of this the world is to form its judgment upon the somewhat fuller presentation of the data.

Our object thus far has been mainly to define our general position. We have ventured to affirm that the New Church system, viewed as a whole, exhibits features of so marked and unique a character—so utterly alien from any thing that could have been reasonably expected at the time and under the circumstances in which it appeared—as to compel the belief that it has originated in a superhuman source. The facts in the case baffle every other mode of solution. This, however, is not a position to be palmed upon any one without proof. It behoves us to assign the grounds on which it rests. In so doing we must of necessity study brevity, as our limits are those of a lecture, and not of a treatise. As the character mainly predicated of the teachings of Swedenborg is that of *newness*, we have accordingly in this system,

I. A new doctrine of the Lord and the Trinity, in which the dogma of three *persons* is discarded, and three divine *principles* acknowledged instead. The *Father* is recognized *in* the Son and not *out* of him, while the Holy Spirit is the proceeding energy and operative agency of both the Father and the Son. In this triad of principles the name Father denotes the divine Love, Son



the divine Wisdom, and Holy Spirit the divine Efficiency in operation and act. These three essentials in the divine nature constitute one Person, and that Person the Lord Jesus Christ, the true and only Jehovah. The Hebrew term *Jehovah* is represented in English by the equivalent title *Lord*, and whenever the Newchurchman employs this title, it conveys to his mind the idea couched under the Old Testament term Jehovah. In the accomplishment of man's redemption this Divine Being, denominated Jehovah, became incarnate, and consequently visible, whereas, prior to that event, he had been invisible. We do not of course say that the inmost *esse* of the Deity, or the Love principle, became visible, for this is impossible; but as we say of a man that he is visible as a whole, though the soul which constitutes his essence is beyond the reach of the senses, so we say of Jehovah that he became visible in the incarnation, notwithstanding the Divine Love or the Father was inwardly and invisibly latent in the humanity of the Son. On this basis of the sole and supreme divinity of Jesus Christ we are taught to fix our regards on Him as the true object of worship, and therefore in the utterance of the Lord's prayer, for instance, we think of no Father in heaven separate from the Lord, who said of himself, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father;" nor do we employ any formula indicating that our prayers are offered to any Divine Father out of the Son for the sake of the Son out of the Father. The invocation of blessings *for Christ's sake* is utterly unknown in the New Church, because we cannot by possibility so separate the Father from the Son as to render such language appropriate to the subject. We are indeed taught to supplicate favors *in Christ's name*, with the promise that whatsoever we thus ask shall be accorded to us, yet in the Word by *name* is signified *quality*, and to ask in the name of Jesus is to ask under a realizing sense of the fact that he is in himself the supreme and only Jehovah, and therefore both able and willing to bestow, without the prompting of an intercessor, every needed blessing.

Such then is the view presented in the revelations of the New Church of the high theme of the Divine nature—a view of which the theology of Christendom, as embodied in the symbols with which Swedenborg was familiar, had never dreamed. It had indeed confessed a divine as well as a human nature in the person of Jesus, but the relation of the two was simply that of *adjunction*, which leaves the problem unsolved, how he could be *essentially* divine, especially in the assumption that he possessed a finite human soul as the inmost element of his being. If the Divinity were simply *adjoined* to the Humanity, we consider it impossible to answer the question why he might not have had a human father as well as a human mother. On the ground of Swedenborg's teaching all difficulty on this score vanishes at once. From supernatural illumination he informs us that the soul in all cases is from the father, and the body and the external man from the mother. "Who does not know that the child has the soul and life from the father, and that the body is from the mother? What therefore is said more plainly than that the Lord had his soul and life from Jehovah God; and because the Divine cannot be divided, that the Divine itself was his soul and life?" The true and absolute Divinity of Jesus Christ can be maintained upon no other basis than this. Here we see the true and only God "manifested in the flesh"—not God merely *adjoined* to the soul and body of a human being like ourselves, but God actually *incarnated* in a tenement of flesh and blood, the materials of which were assumed in the womb of the virgin. Thus constituted, our Lord, instead of being a *stationary* personage, subject to no change of internal state, entered from the outset upon a mysterious process of glorification, the type of our own regeneration, which resulted finally in the complete putting away of the infirm humanity derived from the mother, and the assumption of a Divine Humanity, in which light he is for ever to be contemplated by his believing people.

Thus differs the new doctrine of Swedenborg from the

old doctrine of Christendom on this grand truth of revelation. According to the established or Athanasian tenet, "the idea," says our author, "is clear that the Lord has a Divine principle and a Human, or that the Lord is God and man; but the idea is obscure that the Divine-principle of the Lord is in the Human as the soul is in the body." And again, "With respect to the union of the Lord's Divine Essence with his Human, and of the Human with the Divine, this infinitely transcends man's conjunction: for the Lord's internal was Jehovah Himself, consequently, life itself: whereas man's internal is not the Lord, nor, consequently life, but a recipient of life. The Lord had union with Jehovah; but man has not union with the Lord, but conjunction."

A proper estimate of this view of the cardinal doctrine of revelation can only be found by contrasting it with the tripersonal tenet which was so generally prevalent at and prior to Swedenborg's day. Can any candid mind fail to be struck with the amazing difference between the two? Does he not perceive in the new elucidation evidence of more than human insight? Was the profound intellect even of Swedenborg capable, by its own powers, of thus penetrating the heart of this "great mystery of godliness," and laying it so clearly open to human intelligence? If not, what inference remains but that he has revealed to the world what was specially and exclusively revealed to him?

II. Flowing by legitimate sequence from the above new doctrine of the Lord and the Trinity, we have also in this system a new doctrine of Atonement—a doctrine out of which the *vicarious* element is totally eliminated, while all its *placating* and *reconciling* virtue remains in full force, though developed from a higher ground. The common tenet, as is well known, is founded upon the idea that justice demands satisfaction for a violated law, and that such a satisfaction has been rendered by the second person of the Trinity to the first. Now, to say nothing of the incongruity of supposing that while all the persons are of equal power, rank, and glory, a satisfac-

tion should be required to be made any more by the Son to the Father than by the Father to the Son, the teaching of the New Church is, that no divine law is ever broken but that satisfaction follows of course; for the satisfaction of every law is either in the obedience of its subjects, or in the self-inflicted penalty sure to visit the transgressor. The law of order in the moral as well as in the physical universe is such that every violation punishes itself, if not immediately, yet eventually. The work of atonement, therefore, was not to expiate past offences, but to restore to man the lost capacity of righteousness by which he could be reinstated in vital conjunction with the Lord. It was a process by which the apostate and alienated heart of man was to be brought back to *at-one-ment* with God. This end could only be effected through his liberation from the powers of hell, which obtained a fatal dominion over him, and this again could not be accomplished except by the Lord's coming into the conditions of humanity, and on that plane contending with and triumphing over man's infernal enemies.

It may indeed be asked why this result could not be effected by a simple act of omnipotence, as he of course holds all hell at his beck. Our reply to this is drawn from one of the distinguishing features of Swedenborg's revelations, and it goes to magnify immensely all prior conceptions of the Divine wisdom and benignity in practically working out the problem of human redemption. These infernal adversaries, who had reduced the race to direful bondage, were really men, or the spirits of men, for of such only do heaven and hell consist. The inhabitants of heaven are indeed called angels, and those of the hells devils, but in either case they belong to the ranks of humanity, and the Most High will never cease to deal with them as such. That is to say, he will never cease to have respect to that moral nature with which they are endowed, nor act towards them in such a manner as to suspend their free-will. Even while engaged in acting against them, he will put due honor upon their preroga-

tive; he will not lose sight of his own image and likeness impressed upon them at creation. He will not deal with them as passive subjects of his infinite power, but as active agents possessed of ability to resist, if they choose, or to succumb to his sovereignty. Now let any one conceive, if he can, any possible mode by which man could have been delivered from this infernal thralldom, consistent with his own freedom and that of his captors and oppressors, except by the Lord's assuming human nature and thus, in infinite condescension, putting himself, as we may say, upon a par with his adversaries. How else could he fight against them and overcome them without at the same time crushing and annihilating them as free agents? But on this head let us hear our author himself. He first defines the nature of that redemption which was to be accomplished in behalf of man :

“ It may be proper first to state the true nature and meaning of redemption. To redeem signifies to deliver from damnation, to rescue from eternal death, to snatch out of hell, and to pluck out of the hands of the devil those that were led captive and bound. This was effected by the Lord when he reduced the hells to subjection. Men could not otherwise have been saved, because the spiritual world and the natural have such a connection with each other, that they are incapable of separation, particularly with respect to men's interiors, which are called their souls and minds, and which, if good, are connected with the souls and minds of angels, but if evil, with the souls and minds of infernal spirits. Such is the nature of this union that, if angels and spirits were to be removed from a man, he would instantly fall down dead like a stock or a stone. Hence may be seen a reason why redemption took place in the spiritual world ; and why heaven and hell were first to be regulated before the church on earth could be established.”—*T. C. R.* 118.

He then goes on to show that this was a work purely divine, and could not possibly have been effected but by God incarnate :

“ The reason why it was necessary for God to become incarnate, that is, to be made man, in order to effect redemption, is, because Jehovah God, such as he is in his infinite essence, cannot approach unto hell, much less enter it, being in that essence in purest and first principles ; therefore Jehovah God being such in himself, if he had only breathed on the inhabitants of hell, he would have deprived them instantly of

life; for he said to Moses, who was desirous of seeing him, 'Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live' (Exod. xxxiii. 20); and if Moses could not see him, much less could the infernal spirits, who, being in the lowest degree natural, are in last and grossest principles, and thus in such as are most remote from God; consequently unless Jehovah God had assumed the Humanity, and thus clothed himself with a body, which is in last or ultimate principles, it would have been vain to have attempted anything like redemption. For who can attack an enemy unless he approach towards him, and be furnished with arms for the battle? Or who can disperse and destroy dragons, hydras, and basilisks in the wilderness, unless he cover his body with a coat of mail, and his head with a helmet, and be armed with a spear in his hand? Or who can catch whales in the sea without a ship, and the necessary tackle for the purpose? By these, and such like comparisons, the combat which the omnipotent God waged with the hells may in some sort be illustrated, though by no means perfectly represented. In this combat he could not possibly have engaged, unless he had first put on the Humanity. But it is to be observed, that the combat which the Lord waged with the hells was not an oral combat, as between reasoners and disputers, for here such kind of warfare would have had no effect; but it was a spiritual combat, or the combat of divine truth from divine good."

"That Jehovah God could not have been thus active and operative, except by his Humanity, may be illustrated by various comparisons; as, for example, it is impossible for persons that are invisible to each other to unite in salutation or conversation: angels or spirits cannot join hands, or engage in discourse with a man, even though they should stand just beside his person and before his face; and the soul of any one cannot converse and negotiate business with another except by means of his body. The sun cannot enter with its light and heat into any man, beast, or vegetable, unless it first enter into the air, and act by that as a conveying medium; in like manner also that heat and light cannot enter into fish but by the medium of water; for it is necessary it should act by means of the element in which the subject of its operation dwells. In short, one thing must be accommodated to another before there can be any communication between them, or any operation of either contrariety or concord."—*T. C. R.* 124, 125.

This is indeed our author's exposé of the true doctrine of Redemption rather than that of Atonement, technically so termed, but every one knows that from their close interrelation with each other, it is impossible to treat them separately. Atonement, that is at-one-ment, is properly the normal effect and issue of Redemption; but it is notorious that the essence of atonement has been for ages regarded as concentrated in the passion of the

cross, and the material blood shed upon Calvary deemed the very element of expiation in behalf of those to whom it was applied by imputation. According to this view, redemption itself becomes identical with atonement, as it is held that by this sacrificial offering of himself in our stead, as our substitute, we are *bought off*, i. e. ransomed or redeemed, not from the dominion of hell, but from the penal wrath of the Father. This involves of course the position that under an infinitely righteous government, the innocent may be substituted for the guilty, provided only it be done with the substitute's own consent. Now we beg to exhibit, in contrast with this, the view taught in the writings of our author embodying what he declares to be a divinely authoritative exposition of the truth on the point in question. We give it in his own language instead of ours, because we wish to conciliate attention to his works by affording specimens of what they contain.

“The passion of the cross was not redemption, but the last temptation which the Lord endured as the Grand Prophet, and it was the means of the glorification of his humanity, that is of the union with the divinity of his Father.”—*T. C. R.* 126.

“It is a fundamental error of the Church to believe the passion of the cross to be redemption itself; and this error, together with that relating to three divine persons from eternity, has perverted the whole church, so that nothing spiritual is left remaining in it. What doctrine more abounds in the books of the orthodox at this day, or what is more zealously taught and insisted on in the schools of divinity, or more constantly preached and cried up in the pulpit, than this, that God the Father, being full of wrath against mankind, not only separated them from himself, but also sentenced them to universal damnation, and thus excommunicated them from his favor; but because he was gracious and merciful, that he persuaded or excited his Son to descend, and take upon himself the determined curse, and so to expiate the wrath of his Father; and that thus, and no otherwise, could the Father be prevailed upon to look again with an eye of mercy on mankind. Likewise that this was effected by the Son, who, in taking upon himself the curse pronounced against men, suffered himself to be scourged by the Jews, to be spit upon, and lastly to be crucified as the accursed of God (*Deut. xxi. 23*); and that by this means the Father was appeased, and, out of love towards his Son, cancelled the sentence of damnation yet only in favor of those for whom the Son should intercede, who was

¶

thus to be a perpetual Mediator in the presence of the Father? These and similar doctrines are at this day sounded forth from the pulpit, and re-echoed from the walls of the temple, as an echo from a wood, and the ears of all present are filled with it. But who that has his reason enlightened, and is restored to health by the Word, cannot see that God is mercy and clemency itself, because he is love itself, and goodness itself, and that these constitute his essence; and consequently that it is a contradiction to say that mercy itself, or goodness itself, can behold a man with an angry eye, and sentence him to damnation, and still abide in his own divine essence? Such dispositions are never ascribed to a good man or an angel of heaven, but only to a wicked man and a spirit of hell; it is therefore blasphemy to ascribe them to God. But if we inquire into the cause of this false judgment, we shall find it to be this, that men have mistaken the passion of the cross for redemption itself; hence have flowed those opinions, as falses flow in a continued series from one false principle; or as from a cask of vinegar nothing but vinegar can come forth; or as from an insane mind, we can expect nothing but insanity."—*T. C. R.* 132.

"That this idea concerning redemption, and concerning God, pervades the faith which prevails at this day throughout all christendom, is an acknowledged truth; for that faith requires men to pray to God the Father that he would remit their sins for the sake of the cross and blood of his Son, and to God the Son, that he would pray and intercede for them, and to God the Holy Ghost, that he would justify and sanctify them; and what is all this but to supplicate three distinct Gods one after another? And, in such a case, how can the notion which the mind forms of the divine government differ from that of an aristocratical or hierarchical government? or from that of the triumvirate which once existed at Rome, if only instead of triumvirate it be called a triumpersonate?"—*T. C. R.* 133.

In the above extracts the prevailing falsities pertaining to the doctrine of the Atonement are clearly traced up to false views of the doctrine of the Trinity, in which the tripersonal theory necessitates the conclusion that the whole virtue of the Lord's redemption-work was concentrated in his ignominious death on the cross, the saving benefits of which are secured to believers by an act of imputation. In what follows we have a view of the *practical* effect of this system of theology which cannot but commend itself with great force to reflecting minds.

"Redemption and the passion of the cross are two distinct things, which ought by no means to be confounded together, and the Lord, by both, assumed the power of regenerating and saving mankind, as was



shown in the chapter on REDEMPTION. From the prevailing faith of the present church, that the passion of the cross constitutes the sum and substance of redemption, have arisen legions of horrible falsities respecting God, faith, charity, and other subjects connected in a regular chain with those three, and dependent on them; as for instance respecting God, that he passed sentence of commendation on all the human race, and was willing to be brought back to mercy, in consequence of that condemnation being laid on his Son, or taken by the Son upon himself, and that only those are saved who are gifted with the merit of Christ either by the Divine foreknowledge or predestination. This fallacy has given rise also to another tenet of that faith, that all who are gifted with that faith are instantly regenerated without any regard to their own co-operation; yea, that they are thus delivered from the curse of the law, being no longer under the law, but under grace; and this notwithstanding the Lord's declaration that he would not take away one jot or tittle of the law (Matt. v. 18, 19; Luke xvi. 17); and his command to his disciples to preach repentance for the remission of sins (Luke xxiv. 47; Mark vi. 12)."

"Consult your reason, and tell me what sort of creatures, in your judgment, men would become, supposing the faith of the present church to continue, which teaches that they were redeemed solely by the passion of the cross, and that those who are gifted with the Lord's merit are not under the curse of the law; and further, that this faith, although a man is altogether ignorant whether it be in him or not, remits sins and regenerates, and that his co-operation in its act, that is, while it is given and enters into him, would defile it, and make salvation void; for by this he would mix his own merit with Christ's. Consult, I say, your reason, and tell me whether, upon this supposition, the whole Word, which insists principally on regeneration by a spiritual washing from evils, and by exercises of charity, must not of necessity be rejected? And then of what use is the decalogue, which is the beginning of reformation, or what purpose can it serve but to be applied by a cook as so much waste paper to wrap up his confectionery? In such a case, what is religion but a kind of lamentable cry on a man's part that he is a sinner, joined with supplication to God the Father to have mercy on him for the sake of his Son's sufferings? And what is this but a religion of the lips only, proceeding from the lungs, without anything of act or deed in it proceeding from the heart? And what then is redemption but a papal indulgence? or what more than the whipping of one monk for the offences of the whole monastery, as is no uncommon practice? Supposing this faith alone to regenerate a man, while repentance and charity contribute nothing, what is the internal man, which is his spirit that lives after death, but like a city on fire, the rubbish of which forms the external? or like cultivated ground or a meadow laid waste by caterpillars and locusts? Such a man appears in the sight of angels just like a person who cherishes a serpent in his bosom, while he covers it with his garment to prevent its being seen;

or like one who sleeps as a sheep in company with a wolf; or like a person who lies down to rest under an elegant coverlet in a shirt woven of spider's webs. And in such case, what is a life after death, when all, according to the differences of their advancement in the regeneration, are to be arranged in heaven, or according to the differences of their rejection of regeneration, in hell, but a merely carnal life, thus like that of a fish or a crab?"—*T. C. R.* 581, 582.

From all this the inference cannot well fail to be drawn, that the essence of Atonement, according to the new developments vouchsafed to Swedenborg, lies not in any vicarious satisfaction made by the blood of Christ to the demands of injured justice, but in that pacification which results from the triumphs of the Lord's conjoint Divinity and humanity over the infernal hosts who held man's moral nature in bondage, and thus enabling him to be saved by a life of righteousness, the fruit of regeneration. "In order to remove hell, and so to avert the impending damnation, the Lord came into the world, and did remove and subdue it, and thus opened heaven, so that he might afterwards be present with man on earth, and *such as live according to his commandments, and might consequently regenerate them; for those who are regenerated are saved.* The doctrine, therefore, which the Church maintains, that unless the Lord had come into the world, no one could have been saved, is to be understood in this sense, that *unless he had come into the world no one could have been regenerated.*" In the matter of salvation everything hinges upon *life*; a new life is itself the essence of salvation, and the grand object of the incarnation, and therefore the quintessence of atonement, is the restoration to man of the capability of a renewed spiritual life, which had been lost by his lapsing under the disastrous power of the spirits of evil.

The first question, undoubtedly, that occurs here is, whether the doctrine is true, or in other words, whether it is scriptural. On this head we appeal to the leading scope of Scripture, and especially the drift of our Lord's own teachings. Now that the doctrine is made known, we hold it to be the most obvious and legitimate sense of revelation; and, at the same time, we maintain that the

Church had for centuries sunk so deep in the abyss of spiritual blindness, that it actually required just such an illumination as that claimed by Swedenborg to unfold the genuine truth on this head, that is, to develop the real sense of Scripture. How could the true nature of redemption have been unfolded, except by means of a discovery of the relation of the spiritual to the natural world? And how could this discovery have been made but by the opening of the spiritual senses, as in the case of the illustrious Seer of the New Church? Yet who would have thought of claiming this, if the prerogative had not been real?

III. A new doctrine of Regeneration stands forth conspicuous in Swedenborg's disclosures. As in every other system, so in this, the nature of Regeneration sustains a close relation to the doctrines taught respecting the Trinity and the Atonement. When the divine essence is conceived of under the tripersonal aspect, and the doctrine of Atonement is simply that of penal satisfaction to justice, then the idea of regeneration resolves itself into an act of sovereignty by which the saving benefits of the Atonement are applied to particular persons, who, for inscrutable reasons in the Divine mind, are selected to be the objects of this favor. On this view, regeneration is set forth as a process purely miraculous, and referable directly and exclusively to the sovereign will and power of Omnipotence. Closely analyzed, it will be found to amount to an act of spiritual creation, strikingly analogous to natural creation, which, it is assumed, was a creation out of nothing. Accordingly as the material universe is supposed to have sprung instantaneously into being by virtue of the simple *fiat* of Jehovah, so by a similar procedure, the soul dead in trespasses and sins is instantaneously created anew, and endowed with spiritual life. There is a direct and sudden infusion of a new principle of life, where there was nothing but the deepest death before. This change, we have said, is according to the prevalent doctrine *instantaneous*, for its abettors hold that there is no medium between life and death; if

a soul is at one moment spiritually dead, and the next is spiritually alive, the change must of course have been instantaneous. And not only so; it is a part of the same theory that the process is complete at once. Regeneration is a new birth, and the idea of a regeneration which is not complete at the time of its occurrence, is as incongruous, in the view of the old theology, as is that of a child but half born. If born at all, is it not *wholly* born? And so, if the soul be quickened into newness of life, can we conceive of its being left by the Divine Regenerator in a state of semi-vitality? Such, then, is the current theory of regeneration. The subject is passive in the act of being regenerated, though he is supposed to pass through certain exercises, and to perform certain duties both before and after the event. The process is regarded as the great turning-point in the moral history of those who experience it, and as the doctrine of the saints' final perseverance affords every security that there will be no fatal lapse afterwards, therefore all anxiety on that score is precluded, and the great aim of pastors and teachers is to get the pilgrims fairly into the *wicket-gate*, making comparatively little account of the subsequent journey to the Heavenly City. This, they seem to think, notwithstanding all its hardships and perils, will in some way take care of itself. It is not denied, of course, that there is a duty of Sanctification, which is formally inculcated from the sacred desk and in the manuals of piety, but it is preached in such a comparatively cold and unimpassioned manner, as proves it to hold but a secondary place, as viewed by the side of the great and paramount work of Regeneration. For the truth of this statement we appeal to the dominant style of pulpit discourses every where, especially among the Revivalists, who make it their great aim to get their hearers *soundly converted*, trusting to covenant grace to keep them so.

What now is the contrary and contrasted view on this theme taught in the New Church? In the first place, Regeneration in this system is a *gradual* and *orderly*

work, entirely remote from anything abnormal, arbitrary, or miraculous. It is, on the contrary, just as orderly as the opening of a flower or the growth of a tree. Man is constituted with the potency of the opening of a series of successive degrees in his mind, to wit, the natural, the spiritual, and the celestial. That is to say, when these degrees are opened at all, they are opened in this order. But it does not follow that they are all actually opened in all men, which is the same as to say that all men are not regenerated, for thousands and millions there are who never get beyond the natural degree—the degree into which all men are born—the degree which is opened to the world with its interests, cares, pursuits, pleasures, ambitions, honors, glories, and gauds. This is the element of the natural man; he is open and receptive to all the influences and delights which come upon him from this source. They are congenial to him, and he desires nothing higher or better. To objects and interests connected with the spiritual world and a heavenly life, his mind is hermetically closed. The external world addresses his external nature, and with that he is content. Under these circumstances, we may say that his designed development—that for which he was originally created—is arrested. He is like a plant that buds, but never blossoms or bears fruit. Remaining in this state, or upon this plane, he fails to reach the maturity of his being, for this no one ever reaches without becoming the subject of Regeneration.

But *how* is this work accomplished, and in what respects do the teachings of the New Church approve themselves of a higher character than those to which we have adverted? The reply to this query involves one of the most striking developments of the New Dispensation. It affords a satisfactory solution of a grand problem in theology, to wit, the conjoint agency of God and man in the work of man's restoration to spiritual life. The necessity of this process rests obviously upon the fact that man's ruling love, which determines his character and his destiny, is in his unregenerate state evil and not

good. It flows forth in the direction of the world and of hell, and not of heaven. It is indispensable that the quality of this love should be changed, but it cannot be changed by a simple act of the will. The fixed bent of the soul, corroborated by long years of habit, can never be altered by a bare volition to that effect, however vigorously exerted. Still there is something which *can* be done. As the moral character, at any given period of a man's history, is the result of the accumulations of his previous life—of a countless series of repetitions of particular acts—so it is only by a cessation of these acts that a contrary predominant cast of character can ever be acquired. Repeated outward acts of evil engender more and more an inward love of the evil. If this love is ever to be abated, the outward acts which had formed it must be abstained from. "Where no fuel is the fire goeth out." Man has the power of self-compulsion by which he can withhold himself from the performance of any given act. The devotee of the intoxicating bowl *can* refrain from drinking, though he cannot by an act of will, nor by *one* act of abstinence, extinguish the appetite. But one act of abstinence does *something*, however little, towards effecting this result in the end, and every act of this kind is not merely the negation of so much evil, but the actual presence of the opposite good, for the Divine influx is ever pressing for admission into the minds of men, and gains entrance in proportion as obstructions are removed. Evil states and habits constitute these obstructions, and so far as they are put away, the contrary goods take their place. How explicit is our author's testimony on this head may be seen from the following paragraph, showing how the spiritual mind is opened :

"The spiritual mind is primarily opened by man's abstaining from doing evils, because they are contrary to the divine precepts in the Word ; if man abstains from evils from any other fear than this, that mind is not opened. The reasons why the spiritual mind is thereby opened and not otherwise are these : First, that evils must first be removed with man, before communication and conjunction can be given him with heaven, for evils, which are all in the natural man, keep heaven shut, which notwithstanding must be opened, inasmuch as

otherwise man remains natural. The second reason is, because the Word is from the Lord, and consequently the Lord is in the Word, inasmuch that He is the Word, for the Word is divine truth, all which is from the Lord; hence it follows, that he who abstains from doing evils, because they are contrary to the divine precepts in the Word, abstains from them by influence from the Lord. The third reason is, that in proportion as evils are removed, in the same proportion goods enter; that this is the case, man may see from natural lumen alone, for lasciviousness being removed, chastity enters; intemperance being removed, temperance enters; deceit being removed, sincerity enters; hatred and the delight of revenge being removed, love and the delight of love and friendship enters; and so in other cases; and the reason of this is, because the Lord enters, and with the Lord, heaven, in proportion as man abstains from doing evils from the Word, because he then abstains from them by influence from the Lord."—*A. E.* 790.

In every case, therefore, where a man by self-compulsion shuns evils as sins, there is an infusion of divine power into the soul, so that the next act of self-denial becomes easier than the former, and so on in increasing ratio as he persists in abstaining from actual evils of every kind. The consequence is, that as the force of the habit becomes weakened, the corresponding love from which flow the external actions, is weakened in the same proportion, till at length an opposite love is established in the soul, the result of which is an opposite life. This is regeneration. Man is active in the process by compelling himself to refrain from the habitual acts which bar out the Divine influx; and the Lord is active by that influx, when admitted, in subduing the workings of the natural man, and turning the current of thought and affection more and more in a heavenward channel. Thus the spiritual and celestial degrees of the mind are successively opened, angelic associations established, and final conjunction with the Lord, the essence of a heavenly life, effected.

The work in its commencement is exceedingly feeble, resembling the first obscure dawnings of the morning light, which are almost too faint to be perceived. But it becomes more and more perceptible as the divine life flows in, and becomes more operative in its control over the evil elements within, and their manifestation with-

out, just as the light of the sun waxes brighter and brighter to the perfect day.

During all this process the understanding takes the lead, and by its power of elevating itself above the level of the will-principle, dictates the course to be pursued by the depraved natural principle in withholding itself from its chosen delights. If the understanding were merged in the will, as is the case both with those who are confirmed in good and those who are confirmed in evil, this process would be impossible; but it has been ordered of the divine mercy since the fall, that these faculties should be separated, and the understanding made capable of acting, in the first instance, in disjunction from the will, in order that regeneration wrought in freedom and rationality might be possible. And for ourselves we are satisfied that this idea of the designed separation of the two grand principles of our being for such an end would never have entered the human mind had it not been suggested from above. But while truth in the operations of the intellect holds the ascendancy at the commencement, and in the earlier stages of regeneration, as leading to good, yet subsequently this order is reversed, good gains the upper hand, and truth is attained as the normal product or outbirth of good. Thus it is that "the good man is satisfied from himself." He has in his devout affection a never-failing spring of truth, for good is warning the seminal principle of all truth. In proof of this let the spiritual-minded man appeal to his own experience. As he advances in the christian life, is he not conscious of wearying in great measure of external acquisitions of knowledge? Does he not find himself instinctively turning inward, and seeking satisfaction in what arises from within the domain of his own bosom? Yet where has this idea ever been advanced before? It is peculiar to the New Church, and the New Church finds its recorded commencement in the writings of Swedenborg.

IV. The system announced by Swedenborg presents an entirely new view of the nature and relations of Charity



and Faith in the economy of salvation. This view is based upon the psychological distinction between Love and Intellect, or Will and Understanding, in which the Love or Will principle is the fundamental ground of being, and the generating source of all thought. Love, in fact, is an essence and not a quality. It is the very inmost element of existence, and is to intellect what heat is to light. Charity is the term applied to Love when its object is more especially the neighbor rather than the Lord, and Faith is the product of Love or Charity, as it comes more properly within the category of the Intellect. Still a genuine faith cannot exist except as it is rooted in the good of charity, which is in fact the essential life of faith. That a contrary impression exists widely in the christian world—an impression, to wit, that charity is the fruit of faith—is beyond a doubt; and that this idea has led to immeasurable mischief in the church is equally past question. Had the truth been known upon the intrinsic nature, and the relative offices of Love and Faith, the case would have been far different. The pernicious dogma of salvation by faith alone would scarcely have been broached to the world. The true doctrine on this subject is, we conceive, clearly taught in the following paragraph, which is replete with a philosophy that the schools have never reached:—

“ That all things of heaven and of the church are from the good of love, and that the good of love is from the Lord, cannot be seen, and therefore it cannot be known, unless it be demonstrated. The reason why it is not known in consequence of its not being seen, is, because good does not enter into the thought of man like truth, for truth is seen in thought, inasmuch as it is from the light of heaven, but good is only felt, because it is from the heat of heaven, and it rarely happens that any one, while reflecting upon what he thinks, attends to what he feels, but only to what he sees; this is the reason why the learned have attributed every thing to thought and not to affection; and why the church has attributed every thing to faith, and not to love, when, nevertheless, the truth, which at this day in the church is said to be of faith, or is called faith, is only the form of good which is of love. Now since man does not see good in his thought, for good, as was observed, is only felt, and is felt under various species of delight; and since man does not attend to the things which he feels in thought, but to those

which he sees there, therefore he calls all that good which he feels delightful, and he feels evil as delightful, this being ingenerate or inherent in him by birth, and proceeding from the love of self and the world, this is the reason why it is not known that the good of love is the all of heaven and the church, and that this in man is only from the Lord, and that it does not flow from the Lord into any but such as shun evils and the delights thereof as sins. This is what is to be understood by the Lord's words, that the law and the prophets hang upon these two commandments, 'Thou shalt love God above all things, and thy neighbor as thyself' (Matt. xxii. 35-38); and I can aver, that there does not exist a grain of truth, which in itself is truth in man, except so far as it proceeds from the good of love from the Lord, and therefore neither is there a grain of faith, which in itself is faith—that is, a living, saving, and spiritual faith, except so far as it proceeds from charity, which is from the Lord. Inasmuch as the good of love is the all of heaven and the church, therefore the universal heaven and the universal church are arranged by the Lord according to the affections of love, and not according to anything of thought separated from them; for thought is affection in form, just as speech is sound in form."—*A. E.* 1217.

This view of the intrinsic relation of Goodness and Truth, or Love and Intellect, prepares us for understanding more clearly and admitting more readily the truth of the general proposition, that Charity produces Faith instead of Faith Charity.

"That spiritual love, which is charity, produces faith, may appear from this circumstance only, that man after death, who is then called a spirit, is nothing else but affection, which is of love, and that his thought is thence derived, wherefore the universal angelic heaven is arranged into societies according to the varieties of affections, and every one in heaven, in whatever society he may be, thinks from his own affection; hence then it is that affection, which is love, produces faith, and the faith is according to the quality of the affection; for faith is nothing else but to think that a thing is so in verity: by affection is meant love in its continuity. But man in the world at this day is ignorant that his thought is from affection and according to it, and the reason is, because he sees his thought, but not his affection, and whereas thought is his affection in a visible form, therefore he knows no otherwise than that the whole mind of man is thought; the case was otherwise formerly with the ancients, where the churches were, who, inasmuch as they knew that love produces all things of thought, therefore made charity, which is the affection of knowing truths, of understanding them, likewise of willing them, and thereby becoming wise, the principle medium of salvation; and inasmuch as that affection makes one with faith, therefore they were unacquainted with the term faith. From these considerations it may not only appear how faith is

formed with man, but also that faith can never produce charity, but that charity, which is spiritual love, forms it to a resemblance of itself, and therein presents an image of itself, and that hence it is that the quality of faith is known from charity and its goods, which are good works, as the quality of a tree is known from its fruit: by the tree, however, is not understood faith, but the man as to his life, by the leaves thereof are signified truths whereby is faith, and by the fruits thereof are signified goods of life, which are goods of charity. Besides these there are innumerable other arcana respecting the formation of faith by charity from the Lord; but still the Lord alone operates all those arcana, whilst man is ignorant thereof; all the operation which is necessary on the part of man, is to learn truths from the Word, and to live according to them."—*A. E.* 790.

To the same purpose speaks the same high authority in the ensuing passage:

"Inasmuch as in the preceding articles the existence of faith from charity is treated of, it shall also be briefly explained which is prior and which posterior. It has been shown that charity produces faith as good produces truth, and as affection produces thought, likewise as fire produces light, wherefore it is speaking altogether contrary to order, and inversely, to say that faith produces charity, or the goods thereof, which are called good works. But it is to be observed that charity, which in its essence is the affection of knowing, of understanding, of willing, and of doing truth, does not come into any perception of man, before it has formed itself in the thought, which is from the understanding, for then it presents itself under some form or appearance, by virtue whereof it appears before the interior sight: for thought that a thing is so in verity, is called faith: hence it may appear that charity is actually prior and faith posterior, as good is actually prior and truth posterior, or as the producing principle is essentially prior to the product, and as essence is prior to existence; for charity is from the Lord, and is also first formed in the spiritual mind, but whereas charity does not appear to man before it is faith, therefore it may be said, that faith is not in man before it is made charity in form; wherefore concerning the existence of charity and faith with man, it may be said that they both exist at the same moment; for although charity produces faith, still, inasmuch as they make one, one can never be given separate from the other, so far as comes to man's perception, neither as to degree nor as to quality."—*A. E.* 795.

The above enunciation of the relation of Charity and Faith is all-important in its bearings upon the accredited doctrine of Justification by Faith alone. Nothing is more notorius than the prominence given in Protestant Christendom to this tenet. According to it the simple

act accepting and appropriating the atoning merits of Christ is that which concentrates within itself the justifying virtue of faith, and from this act every admixture of charity or good works is to be carefully excluded, lest in some way a latent element of merit should insinuate itself, and thus detract from the all-perfect merits of the Saviour. True, indeed, this fact of the exclusion of Charity from all consideration in the process of justification will for the most part be denied by the advocates of the scheme, for the reason that certain invented methods of conjoining faith and works have been adopted in theology, whereby the deadly wound inflicted upon the truth by the doctrinal separation of these principles is ostensibly healed. The repeated mention in the Word of works, of life, of loving and doing, goes so emphatically against the idea of resting the whole result upon a bare act of faith, that the asserters of the doctrine feel themselves under a kind of involuntary constraint to give them some place in the scheme which they have devised. But it is not intelligently done, as a searching logical inquest will show. They pay an unconscious tribute to truth, by acknowledging that some provision is to be made for the operations of charity in the process of justification, yet you find it impossible to discover precisely where it comes in. The promise made to the ear is broken to the heart, for it is palpable that in the formal enunciation of the doctrine, Charity and its works are utterly excluded from all participation in the act. On this head we insert a paragraph from our "Reply to Dr. Woods," published some years since. The Dr. had charged Swedenborg with misrepresenting the doctrine of Luther and the Reformers in regard to the tenet we are now considering: "I cannot but ask how Swedenborg has misrepresented the doctrine, and if he has, what is the doctrine which is to be considered as adopted by the Protestant churches? I wish to know whether they adhere to the Augsburg Confession, the *Formula Concordiæ*, which teaches that good works, which are said freely and spontaneously to follow faith, and are called

the fruits of faith, have no real connection with faith, and accordingly do not contribute at all to salvation. Is it your belief that these works are merely *signs* and *manifestations* of a justifying faith, but not entering at all into its essence and efficacy? I can truly say that I am exceedingly anxious for light on this point, for in no department of Protestant Theology, excepting perhaps that of the Trinity, do I find myself so beset with mystery and confusion as in regard to the fundamental principle of a sinner's justification. On the one hand, it is ascribed to faith to the exclusion of works, or of the moral element from which good works proceed; on the other, it is said it must not be a dead faith, or a faith not productive of such works. But a dead faith is not properly any faith at all, and no one supposes that a man can be justified without a faith that is alive. What is it then that constitutes the life of faith—such a faith as actually produces justification? Is it not love or charity, and is not this element to be taken into account in the justifying function of faith? Is not its exclusion like ascribing a moral character to an act of the body with which the soul has nothing to do? What is a mere intellectual belief of the truth, however strong and confident, which is not pervaded and vitalized by the affection of love? And what a strange anomaly must it be in the divine proceedings to account a man just in the absence of the only principle which can make him just?—to insist upon a faith which can only be a *living* because a *loving* faith, and yet exclude from consideration the very love which is its life?"

It will be seen from the tenor of what we have now spread before our readers, that the teaching of Swedenborg on the doctrine of Faith and Charity, in their mutual relations to each other, is immeasurably in advance of any thing propounded to the world by its theological oracles, inasmuch as they are founded upon a psychological or ontological necessity growing out of the very elements of our being. Love is the inmost essence of life, while intellect is the form of its manifestation. As

faith comes primarily into the category of the intellect, though still as an element of salvation inseparable from charity or love, so it must be in its own nature posterior to love and its works, and not their parent, as the creed of Christendom for the most part maintains. Let the candid judge of dogmas pronounce upon the two opposing views, and then let him say whether he deems the developments of Swedenborg on this score as coming within the reach of man's unaided ability. Was such an enucleation of the inner structure of our being to have been rationally anticipated *a priori* as the basis of the true doctrine? And is not the fact of its having been done by human agency a proof that it has been dictated by a super-human authority?

Beside the doctrinal department of Swedenborg's writings, there is another portion usually known as the *Memorabilia*, or *Memorable Relations*, the scope of which is to unfold the leading phenomena and laws of the spiritual world. Into this world he claims to have been admitted by a peculiar kind of intromission, to which we may properly give the name of extacy or trance, a state similar to that of the ancient prophets when favored with visions and revelations of God, except that in Swedenborg's case, the rational faculty, instead of being in the least suspended, was all along sustained in the full exercise of its highest functions, and he was enabled to describe on the natural plane what was, at the very time, transpiring on the spiritual. This fact distinguished Swedenborg's spiritual experience from that of all the seers and spiritual illumined who had preceded him. We do not learn, in regard to any of them, that they were empowered, as he was, to be thus in the natural and the spiritual world at one and the same time.

In the enjoyment of this prerogative, he has poured a flood of light on the mysteries of trans-sepulchral life. He has disclosed to us a state of existence appropriate to spirits disenthralled from clay, and yet so related, in a thousand points, to the terrestrial life that we perceive the

same great fundamental laws of being obtaining in both worlds, and are therefore furnished in what we know of the present, with a criterion by which to judge of the alleged facts of the future. On this class of statements we are called to pronounce judgment, and the verdict we may pronounce upon them will reflect itself upon the whole system of which they form a part. The force of the evidence drawn from this source depends upon the fact, that many of the relations are of a character intrinsically rational and probable, and at the same time apparently so strange and anomalous, so remote from all ideas previously entertained on the subject, that we are here also shut up to the belief of a divine suggestion. We are free to appeal to the intelligence of all considerate men, whether they deem it at all probable, that the following professed revelations would ever have been made had they not been true; that is, would they ever have occurred to any mind so imbued with traditionary dogmas and impressions as even Swedenborg's must inevitably have been, in the circumstances in which he was placed. Examples in point are very numerous; we adduce a few of the most striking.

I. The formation of a *new heaven*. What enunciation could be uttered more at variance with all preconceived ideas than this? Is not heaven universally looked upon as the very type of permanence? Should we not *a priori* as soon look for a change in the unchangeable Jehovah himself, as for any new phase in the heaven in which he dwells, and which is made heaven by his immutable presence? Yet this is among the disclosures of the New Church system, where also the grounds of it are exhibited.

“‘And I saw a new heaven and a new earth,’ signifies that a new heaven was formed out of Christians by the Lord, which at this day is called the Christian heaven, where they are who had worshipped the Lord and lived according to his commandments in the Word, who therefore have charity and faith; in which heaven also are all the infants of Christians. By a new heaven and a new earth, is not meant

a natural heaven visible to the eye, nor a natural earth inhabited by men, but a spiritual heaven is meant and an earth belonging to that heaven where angels are ; that such a heaven and an earth belonging to it is meant, every one sees and acknowledges, if he can only be abstracted a little from ideas purely natural and material when he reads the Word. That an angelic heaven is meant is evident, because it is said in the next verse, that he saw the city holy Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, by which is not meant any Jerusalem that came down, but a church, and the church upon earth comes down from the Lord out of the angelic heaven, because the angels of heaven and men of the earth, in all things relating to the church, make one. Hence it may be seen, how naturally and materially they have thought and do think, who from these words and those which follow in the same verse have fabricated a notion that the world is to be destroyed, and that there will be a new creation of all things. This new heaven is sometimes treated of above in the Apocalypse, especially in chap. xiv. and xv. ; it is called the Christian heaven, because it is distinct from the ancient heavens, which were composed of men of the Church before the Lord's coming ; these ancient heavens are above the Christian heaven : for the heavens are like expanses, one above another ; it is the same with each particular heaven ; for each heaven by itself is distinguished into three heavens, an inmost or third, a middle or second, and a lowest or first, and so it is with this new heaven ; I have seen them and conversed with them. In this new Christian heaven are all those who, from the first establishment of the Christian Church, worshipped the Lord, and lived according to His commandments in the Word, and who thereby were in charity and at the same time in faith from the Lord through the Word, consequently who were not in a dead faith but in a living faith. In that heaven likewise are all the infants of Christians, because they have been brought up by angels in those two essentials of the church, which consist in acknowledging the Lord to be the God of heaven and earth, and in leading a life conformable to His commandments in the decalogue."—*A. E.* 1285.

"It is written in the Revelation, 'I saw a new heaven and a new earth : for the former heaven and the former earth were passed away. And I John saw the holy city New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband' (xxi. 1, 2). The like also is written in Isaiah : 'Behold, I create a new heaven and a new earth : be ye glad and rejoice for ever ; for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy' (lxv. 17, 18). It has been shown already in this chapter, that a new heaven is at this day forming by the Lord, of such Christians as acknowledged him in the world, and were able after their departure out of the world, to acknowledge him to be the God of heaven and earth, according to his own words in Matt. xxviii. 18."—*T. C. R.* 781.



"It is agreeable to divine order, that a new heaven be formed before a new Church on earth; for the Church is both internal and external, and the internal church forms a one with the church in heaven, and consequently with heaven; and that the internal must be formed before the external, and afterwards the external by the internal, is a truth known and acknowledged by the clergy in the world. In proportion as this new heaven, which constitutes the internal of the Church in man, increases, in the same proportion the New Jerusalem, that is, the New Church, comes down from that heaven; so that this cannot be effected in a moment, but in proportion as the falses of the former church are removed; for what is new cannot gain admission where falses have before been implanted, unless those falses be first rooted out; and this must first take place among the clergy, and by their means among the laity; for the Lord says, 'No man putteth new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break and the wine runneth out; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.'—(Matt. ix. 17; Mark ii. 22; Luke v. 37, 38.)"—T. C. R. 784.

From this it appears that the reason of the formation of this New Heaven was, that it might constitute the internal of a New Church to be established on the earth in fulfilment of the oracles of prophecy. This supposes a closer connexion between the spiritual and the natural worlds than had ever been conceived before—so close, indeed, that the one is destined to serve as the soul of the other; but whether the novelty of the announcement is sufficient to make it incredible, we leave it to the world to determine. The inspired predictions mean *something*; can a more rational explanation be suggested?

II. It must be felt to be a strange intimation, that men, or rather men-spirits, of every class, are allowed to make the experiment whether they can be happy in heaven.

"It is to be observed, that in the other life heaven is denied to no one by the Lord, and that as many as will may be admitted; (heaven consists of societies of angels, who are in the good of love towards the neighbor and of love to the Lord;) they are let into the societies of such when they are let into heaven, but when the sphere of their life, that is, when the life of their love is not in agreement, in this case there ensues a conflict, and hence they have torment and dejection. Thus they are instructed concerning the life of heaven, and concerning the state of their own life respectively, also concerning this circumstance, that no one hath heaven merely by being received or let in, as is the common opinion in the world, and likewise that man, by a life in the world acquires the capacity of abiding hereafter with those who are in heaven."—A. C. 8945.

"Sometimes spirits recently deceased, who interiorly have been evil during their lives in the world, but exteriorly have borrowed an appearance of good by the works which they have done for others for the sake of self and the world, have complained that they were not admitted into heaven, they having no other opinion of heaven than as of a place into which they might be admitted by favor. But it was sometimes answered them that heaven is denied to no one, and if they were desirous of it they might be admitted. Some also were admitted to the heavenly societies which were nearest the entrance, but when they came thither, by reason of the contrariety and repugnance of the life, they perceived, as was said, an agony and torment, as it were infernal, and cast themselves down thence, saying afterwards that heaven to them was hell, and that they had never believed that heaven was such."—*A. C.* 4220.

If heaven be a state rather than a place, why should not this be deemed credible? What is there in the Divine perfections that should forbid to any lost spirit an experimental proof that his exclusion from bliss was owing to no arbitrary decree of Omnipotence, but solely to the incapacity created by the moral *status* of his own mind? Yet who would have ever thought of this had it not been true?

III. Of a similar character is the intimation, that even the righteous who are saved, often suffer severely in the other world prior to their full elevation to heaven.

"Besides the hells, there are also vastations, concerning which much is stated in the Word. For man, by reason of actual sins, brings with him into another life innumerable evils and falses, which he accumulates and conjoins: and this is the case even with those who have lived uprightly. Before, then, they can be elevated into heaven, their evils and falses must be dissipated, and this dissipation is called vastation. There are many kinds of vastations, and the times of vastation are longer and shorter, some in a very short time being taken up into heaven, and some immediately after death."—*A. C.* 698.

"There are many persons, who during their abode in the world, through simplicity and ignorance, have imbibed falses as to faith, and have formed a certain species of conscience according to the principles of their faith, and have not, like others, lived in hatred, revenge, and adulteries. These in another life, so long as they are principled in what is false, cannot be introduced into the heavenly societies, lest they should contaminate them, and therefore they are kept for a certain time in the lower (*Rev.* vi. 9; vii. i; x. 5; xiii. 11, &c.) earth, in order that they may put off these false principles. The periods of their

continuance there are longer or shorter according to the nature of the falsity, the life which they have thereby contracted, and the principles which they have confirmed in themselves; and some of them suffer severely, but others only in a trifling degree. These states are denominated vastations, and are frequently mentioned in the Word. When the time of vastation is over, they are taken up into heaven, and, being novitiates, are instructed in the truths of faith by the angels amongst whom they are received."—*A. C.* 1106.

The only plausible objection to this statement is one founded upon the connected dogmas of an instantaneous and sovereign regeneration, a righteousness imputed by faith, and a consequent immediate transmission at death to the heavenly mansions. A virtual response to this objection will have been read in the tenor of our preceding remarks upon the leading doctrines of the New Church. To those remarks we have nothing now to add.

IV. Parallel with the above is the declaration, that the Lord never punishes, never afflicts, never casts into hell any of his creatures; neither is he ever angry, wrathful, or vindictive, inasmuch as these are passions utterly and eternally repugnant to that infinite love, mercy and benignity which form his very essence.

"Such is the equilibrium of all and everything in another life, that evil punishes itself, so that in evil is the punishment of evil. It is similar in respect to the false, which returns upon him who is principled therein, hence every one beings punishment and torment on himself by casting himself into the midst of the diabolical crew, who act as the executioners. The Lord never sends any one into hell, but is desirous to bring all out of hell; still less does he induce torment; but since the evil spirit rushes into it himself, the Lord turns all punishment and torment to some good and use. It would be impossible there should be any such thing as punishment, unless use was the end aimed at by the Lord, for the Lord's kingdom is a kingdom of ends and uses, but the uses which the infernal spirits are able to promote, are most vile, and when they are exercised in promoting those uses, they are not in so great a state of torment; but on the cessation of such uses, they are cast again into hell."—*A. C.* 696.

Swedenborg makes the torments of hell to be the fixed and inevitable result of the moral laws by which the universe of creatures is governed, and consequently pre-

cludes all idea of anything arbitrary in the allotment of the wicked, or of any positive direct infliction of wrath on the part of the Creator. Evil is its own punishment, and all those expressions which seem to indicate that the Lord, by his own act, under the prompting of vengeance or anger, heaps sufferings on the wicked, is merely the language of *apparent* and not of *real* truth. "In many passages in the Word, anger and wrath, yea, fury against men are attributed to Jehovah, when yet there appertains to Jehovah pure love and pure mercy towards man, and not the least of anger; this is said in the Word from the appearance, for when men are against the Divine, and hence preclude the influx of love and mercy to themselves, they cast themselves into the evil of punishment and into hell; this appears as unmercifulness and revenge from the Divine, on account of the evil which they have done, when yet nothing of the sort is in the Divine, but it is in the evil itself."—*A. C.* 8483. This idea is still more forcibly amplified in the following passage, where he is speaking of the Lord's "breaking in pieces his enemies:" "They are called enemies, foes, and haters, not that the Lord is an enemy to them, or bears hatred towards them, but because they are haters and enemies in opposition to the Divine; but when they themselves devastate themselves and cast themselves into damnation and into hell, it appears as if it comes from the Divine: this appearance or fallacy is like what befalls him who sees the sun every day revolving round our earth, and hence believes that it is the motion of the sun, when yet it is the motion of the earth; and like what befalls him who sins against the laws, and on that account is judged by a king or judge, and is punished, in that he believes the punishment to come from the king or judge, when yet it comes from himself, who acts contrary to the laws; or like what befalls him who casts himself into water, or into fire, or who runs against a pointed sword, or against a troop of enemies, in that he believes that his destruction comes from these sources, when yet it comes from himself: such is the case with those

who are in evil.”—*A. C.* 8282. The truth, therefore, finds no fellowship with the idea that the torments of hell are the direct inflictions of divine wrath. Although they are like everything else, primarily referable to Jehovah, yet he interposes no more directly to the accomplishment of his ends in that world than in the present. There, as well as here, he works by subordinate means and ministries, and no more punishes the evil than rewards the good, independent of the operation of established moral and psychical laws of order. Consequently the ground appears evident of Swedenborg’s assertion, that God casts no one into hell. The language which implies this is merely economical. As man is the cause of his own evil, and as evil is hell so far as it exists, he as voluntarily plunges himself into hell as he does into evil. “The Lord is so far from bringing men into hell, that he delivers man from hell, as far as man does not will and love to be in his own evil. All man’s will and love remains with him after death; he who wills and loves evil in the world, the same wills and loves evil in the other life, and then he no longer suffers himself to be withdrawn from it. Hence it is that the man who is in evil is tied to hell, and likewise is actually there as to his spirit, and after death desires nothing more than to be where his own evil is: wherefore man after death casts himself into hell, and not the Lord.”—*H. & H.* 547. It is not, however, to be inferred from this, that the terrors of that doom are at all abated on the ground of their being of the spirit’s own procurement.

V. It is a signally *new* intimation that every one without exception is kindly received by celestial angels upon his first coming into the spiritual world. The prevailing idea inculcated by theology has been, that the souls of the wicked, as soon as they were breathed out of their earthly tenements, were seized upon by exulting fiends and plunged forthwith into the pit of hell. Swedenborg gives us a very different doctrine on this head :

“When the celestial angels are with a resuscitated person, they do not leave him, because they love every one; but when the spirit is such

that he can no longer be in company with the celestial angels, he desires to depart from them. . . . But still the angels do not leave him, but he dissociates himself from them; for the angels love every one, and desire nothing more than to perform kind offices, to instruct, and to introduce in heaven; their highest delight consists in that. When the spirit thus dissociates himself, he is received by good spirits (of a lower grade than angels), and when he is in their company also, all kind offices are performed for him: but if his life in the world had been such that he could not be in the company of the good, then also, he wishes to remove from them, and this even until he associates himself with such as agree altogether with his life in the world, with whom he finds his own life."—*H. & H.* 450.

Such is the statement. It remains for the rational mind to judge whether the munificence of the Divine mercy, through the affections of the angels, cannot *afford* thus to welcome the new comers, whatever their character, into the world of spirits, leaving it to the workings of their spiritual affinities to determine their final allotment. Does our author more than merely utter the voice of an obvious philosophy when he affirms it to be the constant law of the spiritual world that like seeks its like, the good always being drawn to the society of the good, and the evil to that of the evil? The above statement is merely an exemplification of the above law.

VI. According to Swedenborg's exhibition of the nature of infernal woe, *remorse of conscience* forms no part of it. The reason is, that conscience with the wicked in hell has become extinct. Every one knows that the tendency of sin and crime is to blunt and deaden the moral sense. A pirate feels less and less compunction with every murder he commits, till at last he becomes callous to remorseless stings. As every successive act of violence thus done to the conscience *tends*, in the present life, to the destruction of the principle itself, we see not but that it must finally become extinct in the other. This is not disproved by the fact that conscience, as is said, sometimes awakens in this world after being long dormant, and causes ineffable agony. This is because the terrific future is not yet fully realized; for when the emotion is analyzed, what is termed remorse has as much

relation to the future as to the past. It is "a certain fearful looking for of judgment," as well as a painful and corroding retrospect of deeds of evil done. It is scarcely possible to conceive of remorse separate from the fear of punishment, without regarding it as implying a real sorrow for sin, which cannot of course exist but in connexion with the workings of a true love to God and goodness. But no principle of this nature can pertain to the wicked in hell. Evil is their element, their life, and how can they feel remorse for wrong when they do not, in their consciousness, recognize wrong? The very groundwork of remorse is wanting within them, because they have utterly extinguished conscience. They *know*, of course, that they are not what they are not; and they *know* that they are devils and not angels; but they cannot feel any regret on this account, inasmuch as they are in their ruling love, and are borne onwards by its power, so that they can no more desire a state of soul opposite to that in which they are, than a body can reverse its motion on the bosom of the flowing stream, and float upwards against the current. As to certain expressions in the Scriptures usually interpreted to denote the torment of an anguished conscience in the other life, such as "the worm that dieth not," "the fire that is not quenched," &c., they undoubtedly imply misery, but not this precise form of misery, for the sense of the inspired letter, or even of figures, cannot stand against the absolute truth of things. We conceive that man's nature is psychologically such that a course of sin gradually destroys the conscience, and consequently that the sinner must finally reach the point where he becomes inaccessible to the actings of remorse. It is probably seldom that this point is reached in the present life, but in hell we see not but it must be, and when it is, remorse must be unknown, except so far as it is identical with fear.

VII. From what has been said above, the inference is easily drawn, that hell is not, as the prevalent opinion holds, *a state of uninterrupted and unmitigated suffering*. As heaven is perhaps usually regarded as an end-

less extacy of joy, so hell is looked upon as an eternal paroxysm of anguish—both of which are conditions inconsistent with the collected exercise of thought, and the free display of character. The pains of perdition are often set forth under representations drawn from the most excruciating tortures which the body can endure on earth. They are resembled to the effects of material fire acting without cessation on the sensibilities of the corporeal structure. Indeed, as the current views of infernal misery are for the most part closely connected with the belief of the resurrection of the body laid aside at death, so the sufferings conceived of are virtually physical sufferings wrought up to the highest possible degree of intensity. But if the torments of the pit are of this description, how can the soul go forth in the ex-cogitation and commission of that transcendent wickedness which is at the same time predicated of the spirits of hell? Can a man *think* whose body is consuming by a slow fire, or whose joints are breaking on the wheel? Is not his whole being concentrated in one intense burning sensation of overwhelming pain? Is this a state compatible with the machinations of evil? Can schemes of iniquity be devised or executed in this condition? Could the devils in hell carry on their concerted plans of temptation, of which men are the objects, if they were at the same time racked and tortured by such ineffable pangs, and drinking to the dregs the cup of divine wrath perpetually held to their lips? The slightest reflection will evince a conflict between the states of *passive suffering*, and *active iniquity*, usually predicated of the fearful lot of the lost. The one must inevitably swallow up the other. But surely we must conceive of hell as a state in which the soul is in a sufficient degree of freedom to act out its dominant impulses. It is then in its peculiar and controlling loves, and these loves will seek expression, and in order to this it must possess a liberty of action which it is impossible to imagine if it has never the least intermission from the most agonizing torture.



The truth must be admitted, that the ideas of most Christians on this subject are singularly gross and sensuous, from being governed so much by the simple import of the *letter* of the Word. Because mention is frequently made of *fire* in connection with infernal woes, the belief has taken root that something of this nature is the veritable source of the unknown anguish that torments the damned. But let the nature of man and the nature of God be duly pondered, and we shall see the intrinsic truth of what Swedenborg affirms on this head. The fire of hell is, in fact, when traced to its primal origin, the very same principle with that which constitutes the essential bliss of heaven. It is the outflowing of the divine Love of the Lord, but modified and perverted by the internal quality of the recipient subjects. Our author speaks thus on the subject:

"Fire, in the supreme sense, signifies the divine love of the Lord. The reason of this signification of fire is, because the Lord from his divine love, appears in the angelic heaven as a sun, from which sun heat and light proceed; and in the heavens the heat from the Lord as a sun is the divine truth; hence it is that fire in the Word signifies the good of love, and light the truth from good. It is from the correspondence of fire and love, that, in common discourse, when speaking of the affections of love, we use the expressions, to grow warm to be inflamed, to burn, to grow hot, to be on fire, and others of a like nature. Moreover, man grows warm from his love, of whatever kind it is, according to the degree of it."—A. C. 951.

"So far concerning the signification of fire in the Word when it is attributed to the Lord, and when it is predicated of heaven and the church. On the other hand, when fire in the Word is predicated of the evil and of the hells, it then signifies the love of self and of the world, and thence every evil affection and cupidity which torments the wicked after death in hell. The reason of this opposite signification of fire is, because the divine love when it descends out of heaven, and falls into the societies where the evil are, is turned into a contrary love, and thence into various burning concupiscences and cupidities, and thus into evils of every kind; and inasmuch as evils carry with them their own punishments, hence arise their torments. From this conversion of the divine love into infernal love with the evil, the hells, where the love of self and the world, and thence hatreds and revenge, have rule, appear as in a flaming fire, both within and round about, although no fire is perceived by the diabolic crew who are in them. From these

loves also the diabolic crew themselves, who are in such hells, appear with their faces inflamed and reddening as from fire."—*A. E.* 504.

This view excludes the gross material conception of literal fire while it retains all that is calculated to give force and pungency to the inspired descriptions of infernal torment. If that view be rejected, what is that which is to stand in its place?

VIII. Passing from the scenery of Hell to that of Heaven, we meet with the apparently anomalous statement, that Heaven is arranged into a countless number of societies, and that these exist collectively in the form of a Grand Man. The grand idea involved in this announcement is one which we think would never have occurred except to a mind that had been favored with a supernatural insight into that world which is so replete with divine wonders. But let us look for a moment at the rationale of the statement.

It is unquestionable, that in point of fact the members of every social body do constitute a unity which may properly be termed human. Every individual has a certain definite relation to the whole. The action of the whole is the joint action of all the parts, and the identity of the whole is the identity of the parts; and so far as a man is truly a man, in his individual capacity, so far he imparts his humanity to the formation of the humanity of the whole. The case is the same as in that of the human body, in which every thing, even the minutest particle, conspires to the general function of the whole. Indeed, the sublime philosophy of Swedenborg presents this as the great law of all aggregate organized forms in the universe. They are made up of correspondent *leasts*. The tongue is composed of an infinity of little tongues—the liver of little livers—the stomach of little stomachs—and so throughout. Thus, too, in crystallizations; every larger mass, of whatever form, whether triangular, hexagonal, or cylindrical, is found to be composed of countless smaller parts of precisely the same figure.

Let this principle be applied to the constitution of

heaven. Man is a man rather from his internal than his external. He is social from his internal attributes still more than from his external; and as it is the internal part of his being which survives death, he enters the spiritual world in the full exercise of all the leading properties and propensities of his nature. He finds himself there, as here, in association. Without losing his individuality, his life is merged in the general life of the whole, and the very same intellectual laws which go in the present world to construct a collective unity from the individual parts, operate there also with equal force. Moral and mental affinities draw into unison those spirits whose distinguishing characteristics adapt them to represent respectively the several grand functions of the human economy. Those who are dominantly in intelligence and wisdom naturally correspond to the head, those who are in affection to the heart, those who are in keen perceptions to the senses, and so throughout the whole extent of the structure. There is obviously no reason why, if one part of the human system should be thus represented, the whole should not be. And how does this differ in essential verity from the teaching of the Apostle, Eph. iv. 16, "From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying itself in love." And again, Col. ii. 19, "Not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together increaseth with the increase of God." Here is the recognition of the church in the human *form*, but certainly not in the human *shape*. The spiritual idea is easily attached to the words, and we have only to carry this idea to the celestial sphere in order to conceive somewhat correctly of the Grand Man of heaven. It is a view of the subject which arises necessarily from the fact that man exists as a man in the other world, and that by the very law of his being he cannot but exist as a part of a great whole, and in a definite relation to that

whole. Every individual man in heaven is to the collective humanity there assembled what every distinct part or particle of the human body is to the entire corporeity. As every organized social body in the present world is inevitably wrought into a human form, in the sense above explained, so from the same cause the same effect results in the world of souls. It cannot possibly be otherwise, unless the distinctive properties of man as man are destroyed by death ; and he that supposes this, must of necessity suppose that God makes playthings of the highest attributes of the highest creature in this sublunary sphere. Towards this conceit we have neither fellowship nor toleration. We believe that God created man for eternal ends, and that this purpose can only be attained by preserving inviolate the grand distinguishing laws of his intellectual and moral nature.

We may presume, then, that a sufficient ground for the main asserted fact of the present disclosure has been laid in the considerations above adduced. The universal heaven exists in the interior form of a Grand Man, because it is composed of a countless multitude of individual men, each of whom, from the very necessities of his being, is a constituent part of a stupendous whole, from the life of which his own cannot by any possibility be sundered without its instant extinction. The vital conjunction of every individual spirit with the totality of spiritual existence, is as indispensable as the vital conjunction of every particle of the human body with the whole. We may approach to a conviction of this by the bare effect of imagining ourselves for a moment to be utterly dissevered from all extraneous being. The very conception is anguish ; and even the thought of being *but one* in the universe with God, though at peace with him, brings with it a feeling of ineffable diminution of bliss. What a single drop of water would be without the ocean, man would be without a fellow. But happily such conceptions are gratuitous. The life of creatures is *inter-pendent*. Each man is "bound up in the bundle of life," whether abiding on earth or in hea-

ven. By the law of reciprocal dependence the humanity of each must conspire to the aggregate humanity of the whole, and for the very same reason that all the separate parts of our being here go to constitute the integrity of an earthly man, do the separate portions of the celestial humanity go to constitute the integrity of a grand celestial man. For the same reason, too, that we each possess higher and lower faculties here, must the Grand Man possess them there also. As there is a province of the head, the heart, the members here, a similar province in each respect must exist there also ; for the material structures in this world are the mere outward elaborations of internal plastic principles, which constitute our essential humanity, and which must equally constitute it, in its collective form, in another world.

IX. Finally, we may advert to that peculiar feature of the system which affirms that truth is not necessarily perceived any more in the other world than it is in this. The perception of genuine truth is relative to the moral state of the percipient. Such truth must shine into the soul by its own light, and the Lord never forces it upon any one. How common the idea that the soul passes at death into the region of unclouded light, and that what men refuse to see and believe in this world they will be compelled to see and believe in the next. Consequently all the different classes of religionists are confident each one that all others will in that world come *per force* into their views. The Baptist has no doubt that all will be Baptists there ; the Presbyterian that all will be Presbyterians ; the Episcopalian, that all will be Episcopalians, and so of all the rest. The man of the New Church, on the other hand, is taught directly the reverse. He has no expectation that all will be Newchurchmen there, although he is perfectly assured of the truth and divinity of the system. He is instructed that a man does not see what he does not love to see. His love principle governs the actings of his intellect, and he is taught that a man may be so immoveably *confirmed* in evil and falsity, as morally to incapacitate him from *ever* appre-

hending the truth. If therefore the stickler for the old theology of Christendom remains to the last rooted and grounded in the firm belief of his favorite dogmas, we cannot give ourselves the consolation of hoping for an auspicious change in the world to come. As the tree falleth so it will lie. There are doubtless those—we trust not a few—whose objections to the New Church teachings are so superficial and superable, who are so far in the good of life and the affection of truth that when the sublime verities of the New Dispensation come in full contact with their intelligence, they will feel the force of the attraction, and will not fail to embrace them; for all pure good is destined in the end to come into conjunction with its appropriate truth. Not so those who are fixed in the rejection of these doctrines. The paramount law will assert itself. Neither man, spirit, nor angel will believe one way while his ruling love draws him another. The love of good is the basis of the perception of truth, and the love of good cannot consist with that love of self and that spirit of self-derived intelligence which prevents a man from allowing the possibility of advancing to higher conceptions of theological truth than he has already attained.

We have thus endeavored to specify a number of the leading characteristic features of Swedenborg's teachings, in order to afford to our readers an opportunity of judging how far it is probable that any human mind, of its own promptings and from the resources of its own reason or sagacity, would ever have devised them. Are not the probabilities a thousand to one against such a supposition? That they are views which are altogether foreign and remote from the ordinary course of thought upon religious topics—that many of them are of a character somewhat to outrage, in the first instance, our settled convictions—will be readily admitted; and if we were shut up exclusively to these phases of the system we should no doubt reject it at once. But then on the other hand it is certain that when more closely examined, analyzed, and scanned, these professed revelations of doctrine and

fact assume a new aspect and possess themselves of the approval of the reflecting reason. They stand out before the mind as more and more worthy the divine source in which they profess to originate. They therefore leave us in the dilemma, that if they were not actually imparted to Swedenborg by a revelation from heaven, but were the fruit of his own cogitations, we have the phenomenon of a genius that soars immeasurably above and beyond any known standard of human ability. As much as you take away from his authority as a divine messenger you place to his account as an unrivalled man, one before whose transcendent powers all the larger and lesser lights of the intellectual firmament "pale their ineffectual fires," like the receding stars before the advancing sun.

And now in view of all that has been offered may we not justly reverse the tenor of the question which we proposed in the outset to answer, and put it thus: "What reasons are there for *not* believing that Emanuel Swedenborg was invested with a divine commission?" For surely the *onus* of the argument lies on the side of the doubters or deniers. What valid plea can any one adduce to justify himself in the rejection of a system which comes to him fortified by such a vast amount of corroborative testimony? Can any one say what is wanting, on the score of evidence, which shall certify a divine revelation to man? Does it not satisfy the head and the heart? Does it not come up to the requisitions of a system of which it is said, "Behold, I make all things new!"

Is it not so? You go into a New Church place of worship, and how *new* is everything that accosts your hearing! The Scriptures exhibit a new character, for no sooner is the Word opened for exposition, than you are invited to the consideration not of the letter but of the spirit. Every thing relative to the text and the application made of it is totally unlike that which you will hear in any other church in Christendom. The very dialect in which the preacher utters himself is in a measure *new*, and although the terms when understood are seen to be altogether appropriate and expressive, yet at first blush they strike the

stranger strangely. He feels that he has, as it were, a new nomenclature to learn when such terms salute his ears as *the sensual, the rational, the Divine*, as epithets without a substantive; *the heavens and the hells*, in the plural; the *proprium, falses*, the *internal*, and the *external man*, the *Lord* incessantly instead of *God* or *Christ*, the *Word* instead of the *Bible* or the *Scriptures*, *influx* instead of *influence*, and the perpetual recurrence of *goodness* and *truth, will* and *understanding*, and other like peculiarities, which might appear perhaps as affectations, but which in fact are every one of them justified by a sufficient reason when the rationale of their use is inquired into. All this is but an element in that universal renovation which characterizes the New Church. The new wine has to be put into new vessels. The old forms of thought, sustained by the old modes of diction, are not adequately receptive of the new ideas which are flowing down from heaven in connection with the dispensation of the New Jerusalem.

This feature of the system, together with its profoundly philosophical character, and the large draft which it makes upon the reflection of the reader, may easily lead, as it often has done, to the impression that the doctrines are not lucid and intelligible to the ordinary mind—that they are abstruse and obscure, and can never be so brought down to the level of the common apprehension, as to become accessible to the masses; but that they must, from the necessity of the case, be confined to the more cultivated and intellectual classes, or to the wealthy who can command leisure to embark in the study of spiritual or metaphysical arcana. This impression, however, we are obliged to set down among other popular errors and delusions in regard to the New Church and its accredited teachings. In point of fact there are no tenets so simple, so easily grasped, so wholly accommodated to ready reception, as those of the New Church when viewed in their *intrinsic nature*, and there is some evidence of this in the fact, that the great majority of past and present receivers have not been persons of the highest order of



intellect or of extraordinary mental culture, but rather of plain, sound, substantial sense, united with a certain honest, upright, truth-loving spirit, which is evermore the most favorable soil for the growth of New Church principles. Yet these persons have not found it at all a stupendous achievement to master the distinguishing doctrines of Swedenborg.

But apart from this we may remark, that the alleged difficulty of comprehending the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, arises not from their intrinsic obscurity, but from the mass of falsities and fallacies with which the minds of readers have been lumbered under former teachings, and which are so alien from the genuine simplicity of truth as almost totally to obstruct its entrance. Just remove the accumulations of theological rubbish which have formerly occupied the mind, and the pure truth of heaven, as imparted through the New Church, will find a comparatively easy access to the understanding, and be seen to accord most harmoniously with its intuitions and judgments.

And why should it not? What can be more plain and simple than its elementary teachings? The system has indeed its strong meat for grown men, but it has also its milk for babes. It has its "fathomless depths where the elephant can swim, and its shoals where the lamb can wade." And should not such be the character of a body of doctrine emanating from heaven? Is not this the character of the sacred Scriptures, embodying an acknowledged revelation from Jehovah? We do not indeed put the two revelations upon a par, but they may properly be compared in this particular respect.

You say the teachings imparted by Swedenborg are not easy to be understood—that they are mystical, recondite, transcendental. Let us bring it to the test. Do you believe there is a real, radical, and all-important difference between right and wrong? Certainly, is your reply. Do you know by conscious perception when you have done wrong? Certainly. Do you not feel, in all such cases, that you *might* have abstained from doing the acknowl-

edged wrong? Undoubtedly. Suppose you had abstained from doing wrong in any given number of cases, do you not see reason to believe that the contrary habit of doing right would have been more and more strengthened and established? I see no ground to question it. Well, if good action strengthen good principle, is it not reasonable to suppose that the more really and deeply any one is principled in good, the good of affection and of action, the more clear, distinct, and luminous will be his perceptions of truth, and the more immersed any one is in evil, the more prone will he be to adopt falsity instead of truth? Of this again I see no ground to doubt. What is more obvious, then, than the close and indissoluble connection between goodness and truth, whose interrelations hold such a conspicuous place in the system? But if any one can grasp the obvious distinction, and at the same time the manifold relation, of these two principles, he has obtained a key to the doctrines of the New Church considered as a practical system; and is this so very difficult? Does it require any remarkable power of discernment to perceive that the will-principle having relation to good is one thing, and the understanding-principle having relation to truth is another? And then as to their relation, does it require the mind of a philosopher to see from the relation of the two, that just in proportion as one is imbued with good he will make progress in truth, and that, on the other hand, as one is enslaved to evil, he will be sure to adopt falsity instead of truth? Thus it is that the sublime philosophy of the New Church will gradually unfold itself, even to the simple minded, while the learned, the mighty, and the noble of the earth will be sure to miss its essential meaning, if they do not pass it by with a supercilious contempt, as unworthy the notice of liberal and enlightened minds.

We venture, then, to assure our fellow-men, that the difficulty complained of in regard to the obscure and incomprehensible character of the New Church doctrines is purely imaginary. All that is requisite is that he who comes to the perusal of the writings should come under

the prompting of a candid, honest, and truth-loving spirit, and that he should pursue somewhat of an orderly course in his reading, by commencing with the works of a more simple character, and proceeding onward to those that are more abstruse. One who should open the elements of Euclid at the 47th Proposition, or at the 3rd Book, might easily object that it was all jargon to him; but let him begin with the axioms, and proceed in an orderly manner from one step to another through the series of demonstrations, and he will find it opening before him with the most delightful lucidness, and conducting him into the interior recesses of the temple of Geometry. So the words of the New Dispensation are like the words of wisdom in Solomon, "plain to him that understandeth and right to him that findeth knowledge."

We have but a brief word to utter in conclusion. We have endeavored to set forth, in a feeble way, the claims of a system of religious doctrine professedly emanating from the Lord himself, and therefore, if those claims are well-founded, worthy of all acceptance. We are confident of addressing numbers who cherish the most profound respect for every word that proceedeth out of the Lord's mouth, and who would as soon submit to the excision of a right eye or the amputation of a right hand, as to turn away from any message that they were assured bore the signet of the King of kings. To minds of this stamp—minds pervaded by these sentiments of unfeigned reverence for divine oracles, through whatsoever medium uttered—we would urge the appeal involved in the present essay. They would not consciously disparage or disregard a divine declaration or monition. Is it not possible they may notwithstanding do so, by withholding that examination which a mission like Swedenborg's deserves at their hands? Attestations of a most striking character will be apparent even to a very superficial inspection. To one of a more thorough-going and penetrating kind, features which betoken a divine origin will assuredly discover themselves, and how can this but constitute an urgent claim to investigation? Suppose the indications of such

an origin have not the constraining force of miracles ; suppose the divine wisdom draws to the study of these writings with the tender filaments of rational suggestion rather than with the cord and cable of sensuous demonstration, is that a reason with an ingenuous mind why the attraction should be unavailing ? Is it not a case where the bare possibility of rejecting a divine message ought to inspire the most solicitous anxiety as to the result ? And can we not ideally realize to ourselves the emotions of intense regret that we should experience upon finding, among the grave disclosures of the future, that the doctrines announced to the world by the Swedish Seer were indeed the very truth of heaven—the theme of angelic pondering—the grand hope of a lapsed humanity ? As, then, we would avoid this pungent regret—as we would be true to our better instincts—as we would put honor upon what bears a divine impress—as we would secure to ourselves the peerless and priceless blessings of a faith which dispels doubt—satisfies reason—purifies life—and antedates heaven, let us bestow a candid and earnest consideration upon the teachings of the New Jerusalem.

## SWEDENBORG AND PAUL.

[N. C. Repos., April, 1855.]

NEW YORK, February 26th, 1855.

PROF. GEO. BUSH,

Dear Sir,—How do you reconcile Swedenborg's view of Esau as denoting the "Good of Life" (*A. C.* 3300, 3322, 3336), with the 12th chap. of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, v. 16, where he says:—"Lest there be any fornicator or profane person as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected, for he found no place of repentance though he sought it carefully with tears."

Yours respectfully,

A STUDENT OF THE BIBLE.

### REMARKS.

A somewhat closer inspection of what Swedenborg has taught respecting the representative function of Esau, would doubtless have precluded the above inquiry of "A Student of the Bible." He would have seen, we think, that there is no real discrepancy between him and Paul requiring to be reconciled. Swedenborg's language, it will be observed, is, that "by Esau is *signified* the good of the natural principle," that is to say, Esau stands as a representative of the good of the natural principle, as also of "the good of life, derived from influx out of the rational principle;" and this representative character he could sustain, admitting all that Paul says of him to be literally true, which of course we do not deny. The law of representation is thus stated by Swedenborg:

"It is a general law of representation, that the person or thing which represents is not at all reflected on, but only that which is represented. As for example: Every king, whosoever he was, whether in Judah, or in Israel, or even in Egypt and other places, might represent the Lord; their regal function itself is representative, whence even the very worst of kings might sustain this representation; as Pharaoh, who exalted Joseph over the land of Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar

in Babylon (Dan. ii. 37, 38), Saul, and other kings of Judah and of Israel, of whatsoever character they might be : it was involved in the very anointing, by virtue of which they were called the anointed of Jehovah. In like manner all priests, how many soever they were, represented the Lord ; the priestly office itself being representative, whence even the wicked and impure could sustain this representation as well as others ; because, in representatives, the quality of the person representing is not at all reflected on."—*A. C.* 1361.

That this is the light in which both Esau and Jacob are viewed in this part of the sacred narrative, is expressly asserted by our author in the summing up of their spiritual history : " In order that the circumstances related in this chapter concerning Esau and Jacob may be apprehended as to what they signify in the internal sense, the thoughts must be removed entirely from the historical, consequently from the *persons* of Esau and Jacob, and instead thereof must be substituted the things thereby represented, viz., the good of the natural principle and its truth, for names in the internal sense of the Word, signify nothing else but things. When the good of the natural principle and its truth are apprehended instead of Esau and Jacob, it then appears evident how the case is with respect to man's regeneration by truth and good, viz., that in the beginning truth apparently has the priority, and also superiority with him, although good in reality is prior and superior."—*A. C.* 3336. From this it appears that a rich spiritual purport is latent in the literal narrative, describing the temporary priority and ascendancy which Jacob gained over Esau. That spiritual purport is, that in the process of regeneration, although good and truth are, like twins, really conceived and born together, yet there is a struggle between them, and truth for a season obtains priority and gets the upper hand, although eventually this order of things is reversed, and the elder, instead of serving the younger, receives an acknowledged dominion on the part of the younger. This is indicated by Isaac's prophetic declaration concerning Esau, " Upon thy sword thou shalt live, and shalt serve thy brother, and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have dominion, thou shalt break his yoke from off

thy neck" (Gen. xxvii. 40). This is briefly explained as follows: "It is to be observed that man, before he is regenerated (*i. e.* in the earlier stages of regeneration), does good from a principle of truth, but after he is regenerated, he does good from a principle of good; or, to make it more clear, before man is regenerated, he does good from the understanding, but after he is regenerated, he does good from the will; the good, therefore, which is from the understanding, is not in itself good, but truth, whereas the good, which is from the will, is good."—*A. C.* 3295.

Now the purpose for which Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, alluded to the case of Esau, did not require him to recognize this interior drift involved in the Mosaic record. His object was to draw an important practical lesson from the literal recital, which he took as he found it, neither affirming nor denying an ulterior meaning in the historian's words. So far as the letter is concerned, Esau is set before us as an impatient or impulsive personage, who, under the prompting of bodily appetite, rashly bartered away, for a momentary gratification, an inestimable blessing, of which he shortly after repented with unavailing tears; and this example the apostle would hold up *in terrorem* before the eyes of those who might be tempted to a like perilous precipitancy in throwing away their hopes of eternal life. This use of the incident was perfectly legitimate, but it militates not at all with that representative or spiritual import which Swedenborg ascribes to it. It is by no means an endorsing of the literal sense as the *only* sense of the narrative. In like manner, when he says, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, "I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ," we are not authorized to regard his language as necessitating the interpretation which supposes that a literal earth-creeing serpent was the real actor in the transaction recorded. His drift in the reference did not call upon him to pronounce upon that point. So when

our Lord would warn his disciples of the danger of apostasy, and for that purpose says to them, "Remember Lot's wife," we are not bound to suppose that he would thereby sanction the idea of her being transformed into a literal pillar of salt. The monition to be administered was very properly deducible from the sense of the letter alone.

There is, moreover, still less ground for our correspondent's intimation of a discrepancy between Swedenborg and Paul, when we advert to the fact of Esau's representative character having an opposite scope in certain other relations, and denoting the evil of life, or of self-love, as we are informed it occasionally does. Thus, "In the Word throughout, mention is made of Esau, and also of Edom, and by Esau is signified the good of the natural principle; but in an opposite sense, Esau signifies the evil of self-love, before false principles are so fully adjoined to that love; and Edom signifies the evil of that love when those false principles are adjoined to it. Several names in the Word have an opposite sense as has been often shown above, by reason that what is good and true in the Church, in process of time degenerates into what is evil and false by various adulterations."—*A. C.* 3322. This explains the rationale in the change of representative import in the same name, so that a striking analogy between the Esaus of the two writers is seen to exist. "In an opposite sense, by Esau and Edom are represented those who turn away from good, in that they altogether despise truth, and are unwilling that anything of truth should be adjoined, which is owing principally to self-love, wherefore in an opposite sense, by Esau and Edom such persons are represented."—*A. C.* 3322. Does not this bring the two sufficiently into parallelism to satisfy the querist? Is not Esau enough of a "profane person," as here exhibited in his representative character, to remove the difficulty in question? If our reply should fail to satisfy "A Student of the Bible," we trust we may hear from him again.